DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 066 114 HE 003 274

AUTHOR	Trow, Martin
TITLE	Technical Report: Carnegie Commission National Survey of Higher Education.
INSTITUTION	Carnegie Commission on Higher Education , Berkeley, Calif.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Research.
REPORT NO	CCHE-TR-7
BUREAU NO	BR 9-0148
PUB DATE	1 Jun 72
GRANT	OEG-0-9-140148-4457(010)
NOTE	132p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$6.58
DESCRIPTORS	*Educational Development; *Educational Planning; *Educational Research; *Higher Education; Questionnaires; *School Surveys; Surveys

ABSTRACT

This document presents the report of a study designed to (1) gather information and develop ideas useful to the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education in making recommendations on public policy; and (2) investigate and illuminate aspects of American higher education of interest to a wide audience of social scientists, faculty, and administrators. The information presented within the report was gathered by means of a questionnaire that was administered to faculty, graduate students, and undergraduate students in 2,3000 colleges and universities throughout the U. S. A fourth study, smaller in sample size than the other 3, conducted of professional researchers in the largest universities of the sample. The data are presented primarily in tabular form with descriptions and discussions accompanying the tables. (HS)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED 066114

TECHNICAL REPORT

Copy #7

National Survey of Higher Education

Dr. Martin A. Trow, Project Director

Grant no. OEG-0-9-140148-4457 (010)

Project no. 9-0148

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

HE 003 274

BR 9-0142
PA 24

ED 066114

TECHNICAL REPORT: CARNEGIE COMMISSION NATIONAL SURVEY OF HIGHER EDUCATION

June 1, 1972

Martin Trow, Director

Professional Staff:

Joseph Zelan, Associate Research Sociologist
Travis Hirschi, Associate Research Sociologist
Stephen Steinberg, Post Graduate Research Sociologist
Saul Feldman, Junior Specialist
Ted Bradshaw, Post Graduate Research Sociologist
Oliver Fulton, Post Graduate Research Sociologist
Carlos Kruytbosch, Post Graduate Research Sociologist
Judy Roizen, Post Graduate Research Sociologist
Sandra Meyers, Post Graduate Research Sociologist
Lynne Alexander, Administrative Assistant
Glenn Edwards, Administrative Assistant
Don Trummell, Programmer
Richard Scheffer, Project Coordinator

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Design and Method	1
The Survey of Faculty Members	2
The Survey of Graduate Students	3
The Survey of Undergraduates	3
The Survey of Professional Researchers	4
II. DECEMBER 1, 1967 to FEBRUARY 1, 1969	5
The Sample of Institutions	5
Faculty and Graduate Students	5
Undergraduates	9
Professional Research Personnel	14
The Enumeration	16
Faculty and Graduate Students	16
Undergraduates	18
Professional Research Personnel	20
Questionnaire Development	22
III. FEBRUARY 1, 1969 to MARCH 1, 1970	23
Data Collection	23
Faculty and Graduate Students	23
Undergraduates and Professional Research Personnel	24
Data Utilization Activities	25
Protection of Respondents' Anonymity	25
Quality Control of Data	25
Study of Response Bias	26
Development of an Institutional File	27
IV. MARCH 1, 1970 to JANUARY 1, 1971	28
Weighting	29
Faculty and Graduate	29
Undergraduate	39

Table of Contents (cont'd.)

IV. MARCH 1, 1970 to JANUARY 1, 1971 (cont'd.)

Nonresponse Bias 49

Faculty 49
Graduates 60
Undergraduates 73

Quality Ranking of Institutions 91

Universities 91
Four-Year Colleges 94

List of American Universities and Colleges by Quality Ranking 97

Quality I Institutions 97
Quality II Institutions 98
Quality III Institutions 100
Quality IV Institutions 102
Quality V Institutions 104
Quality VI Institutions 107
Quality VII Institutions 117

TABLES

Table #		Page
1	ACE Sample Institutions through 1968 and Responses to 1968-69 Solicitation for Faculty and Graduate Student Lists	10
2	Participating Institutions and Individuals	18
3	Faculty and Graduate Participation in Followup Study	24
4A	Assignment of Institutions to 1966 ACE Cells with Faculty Institutional Weights	30
4B	Assignment of Institutions to 1966 ACE Cells with Graduate Student Institutional Weights	31
5	Actual Population of Graduate Students in Quality Strata and Number of Graduate Students Estimated from 1966 ACE Cells	34
6	Correction Factors for Quality and Control Bias in 1966 ACE Sample -- Faculty and Graduate Students	35
7	Distribution of Final Weights Adjusted for Quality, Control, and Nonresponse -- Faculty and Graduate Students	38
8	Undergraduate Enrollment Data	39
9	Strata Weights	42
10	Adjustment Factors	43
11	Range of Final Weights by Year	44
12	Verification of Weights by Control	46
13	Verification of Weights by Type and Quality	46
14	Verification of Weighting Cells	47
15A	Distribution of Sex in the Achieved and Criterion Sample (Faculty)	51
15B	Distribution of Quality in the Achieved and Criterion Samples (Faculty)	52
16	Distributions of Selected Characteristics in the Achieved Sample and the Criterion Sample (Faculty)	52
17	Faculty -- Interests Primarily in Research or Teaching	55
18	Faculty -- Percent with Interests Heavily in Teaching by Qaulity of Institution	55
19	Political Self-Identification (Faculty)	56

TABLES (cont'd.)

Table #		Page
20A	Rank by Quality of Institution Faculty-Achieved Sample	58
20B	Rank by Quality of Institution Faculty-Criterion Sample	59
21A	Date of Birth by Quality of Institution Faculty-Achieved Sample	59
21B	Date of Birth by Quality of Institution Faculty-Criterion Sample	60
22A	Distribution of Quality in the Achieved and Criterion Samples (Graduate)	62
22B	Distribution of Sex in the Achieved and Criterion Samples (Graduate)	62
23	Distributions of Selected Characteristics in the Achieved Sample and the Criterion Sample (Graduate)	
A	In What Year Did You First Enter Graduate School?	64
B	Highest Degree Working for	65
C	When Do You Expect to Get the Degree You Are Now Working for?	66
D	Department in Which You Are Studying	67
24	Employment Status in the Achieved and Criterion Samples (Graduate)	68
25	Political Self-Identification (Graduate)	68
26A	Political Identification by Quality of Institution (Achieved Sample)	69
26B	Political Identification by Quality of Institution (Criterion Sample)	70
27A	Age by Quality of Institution (Achieved Sample)	71
27B	Age by Quality of Institution (Criterion Sample)	72
28	Response Rates by Year Entered College as a Freshman	75
29	Measure of Socio-Economic Status of Undergraduates	77
A	Father's Educational Attainment	77
B	Mother's Educational Attainment	77
C	Total Family Income	78
D	Race	79
30	Sex	80

TABLES (cont'd)

Table #		Page
31	Quality of Entering Institution	82
32A	High School Grade Point Average	84
32B	Highest Degree Intend to Obtain	84
33	Control of Institution: Public/ Private	85
34	Intended Major Field	86
35	Final Weighted Distributions	89
A	Quality of Entering Institution (Criterion and Achieved Samples)	89
B	High School Grade Point Average (Criterion and Achieved Samples)	89
C	Sex (Criterion and Achieved Samples)	90

I

This report derives from a questionnaire survey of faculty, graduate students and undergraduates conducted by the Carnegie Commission's National Survey of Higher Education in the Spring and Fall of 1969. In broad outline, the study comprises three major sample surveys in the 2,300 institutions of higher learning in the United States: one of faculty members, a second of graduate students and a third of undergraduates. A fourth study, smaller in sample size than the other three was conducted of professional researchers in the largest universities in our sample.

This study has two general purposes: to gather information and develop ideas useful to the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education in making recommendations on public policy; and to investigate and illuminate aspects of American higher education of interest to a wide audience of social scientists, faculty, and administrators.

Design and Method

The faculty and graduate student surveys were done in cooperation with the Cffice of Research of the American Council on Education; the survey of undergraduates was done collaboratively with them. Since 1966 ACE has been conducting surveys of new students in a national sample of over 300 institutions of higher education, representative of all types of American colleges and universities, two and four year, public and private. The data they have collected and the procedures developed for

gathering and processing survey data were helpful in carrying out the present study.

The ACE sample institutions were selected by a stratified probability method. This sample was used with some modifications, for the three major surveys. All four surveys used mail questionnaire forms. Detailed enumerations were carried out for the faculty, graduate students and professional reseachers.

The Survey of Faculty Members

Some 461,000 full- and part-time faculty members serve in over 2,300 American colleges and universities. In 1967, the institutions in the ACE sample employed about 115,000 faculty members. The decision to conduct a census of this population was based on several considerations:

1. Most colleges are small: to sample their faculty would produce too few cases to allow us to represent either the faculty as a whole or its major segments.

2. Relatively large numbers of responses allow much finer analyses of specific categories of faculty than would otherwise be possible.

The population to be studied was to include all people, other than graduate teaching assistants, actually carrying the burden of instruction in these institutions at the time the survey was administered.

The Survey of Graduate Students

In 1967 the ACE sample institutions enrolled approximately 370,000 students beyond the baccalaureate level, the great majority enrolled in the 90 universities in the sample. Nearly 40,000 however, were enrolled in what are predominantly four year institutions, most of them concentrated in some 60 of the larger "four year" colleges.

This survey was to include 50,000 graduate students sampled randomly from the fall lists of graduate students in the ACE institutions. The aim was to sample students in all graduate fields and professional schools in ways that allow the preparation, through appropriate weighting, of estimates describing the population of graduate students in American colleges and universities.

The Survey of Undergraduates

During the fall of 1969 there were approximately 6,000,000[1] undergraduate students in accredited colleges in the United States. The institutions in the undergraduate sample enrolled about 750,000 of these students.

The undergraduate survey utilizes a sample of those students who responded to the American Council of Education ongoing research of first time students during the fall terms 1966-1969 inclusive. This sample design provided the benefit of panel data for all respondents and easy access to student names and addresses, though it failed to reach those students in sample institutions who first entered college more than

---

1. Estimate, Digest of Educational Statistics, 1969 edition, p. 2, Digest of Educational Statistics, Washington, D.C., U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education (September, 1969).

four years earlier and those students who transferred into a sample institution after first enrolling in another institution. However, the survey did include those who dropped out or transferred from a sample institution after entering during these 4 terms.

The undergraduate sample was designed to include approximately 200,000 students. These students were sampled from the respondents to the ACE freshman surveys in a manner which insured representation from each initial cohort in each institution sufficient to provide reliable data on the student body as a whole and on its major segments, as the other surveys aimed to do. These sampling goals were achieved by eliminating from the original sample of 310 institutions those which had not participated during all of the years 1966-69, those with poor response rates to the ACE freshman questionnaires, and those with inadequate student name and address files. This reduced the institutional sample to 189. Then, up to 1,000 students were selected from each institution, distributed by their entrance cohort.

Survey of Professional Researchers

The study of professional researchers is aimed at those researchers employed in the largest "federal-grant" universities. Unlike the other major surveys the aim is not to include a representative sample of institutions. Data from various sources indicate that research personnel make up 20 to 33 percent of the academic staffs of graduate degree granting institutions with the proportions rising to over 50 percent in a few major universities. But Office of Education figures (Faculty and Other Professional Staff in Institutions of Higher Education, 1963-64) indicate that 31 institutions employed 61 percent of all "non faculty" researchers. Twenty-two of the top 31 employers of research personnel are ACE sample institutions.

The aim of the survey was to do a census of researchers in these institutions, attempting to reach some 10,000 researchers.

II

Work on the surveys began December 1, 1967. During the first period of the study, December 1, 1967 to February 1, 1969, all of the planning, determination of basic sample design, the enumeration of faculty and graduate students, and the development of questionnaires for all the studies except the undergraduates was completed. This stage was funded entirely by the Carnegie Commission.

A major effort during this period was gathering ACE individual and institutional data from prior years for preliminary analysis. Also data was obtained from the Bureau of Applied Social Research and the Office of Education for use in preliminary analysis and later in the preparation of final data.

The decision to use the ACE sample of institutions was made at this time and preliminary letters were sent to ACE institutional representatives.

The Sample of Institutions

Faculty and Graduate Students

Every sample represents a compromise among different and to some degree incompatible research interests. For example, insofar as we wish to generalize our findings to all (or nearly all) of American higher education, we want a broadly representative sample of all the kinds of institutions that make it up. Insofar as we want to write in more detail

about a specific kind of institution--say, the public junior colleges--not only is a representative sample of those institutions needed, but one large enough to reveal the diversity within a category that appears homogeneous only to those who do not know it.

The ACE sample draws on the whole universe of American higher education, omitting only those institutions which have been created since the 1965-66 Education Directory, Part 3 was prepared, and those which have grown into "eligibility" (having a freshman class of at least 30) since that time. The sampling design provides adequate samples of students and faculty in all sizes of institutions, and in most categories of institutions. The advantages of using the ACE sample rather than designing and drawing a new sample were felt to outweigh any marginal gains that a new sample might allow.

1. Use of the ACE sample affords us access to some 300 institutions with whom the ACE has a continuing research relationship and established procedures for gathering data.
2. Using the ACE sample of institutions presents us with a very large amount of information about the sample institutions and their student bodies.
3. For the undergraduates, panel data is available for individuals who entered and continued in the sample institutions.
4. The ACE procedures provide our own survey with a means of reaching with our own questionnaire those who entered the sample institutions during given years. This would otherwise be a serious problem, since many institutions have no records of the home addresses of their students.

5. The ACE data in addition, allows us to identify and study the special characteristics of drop-outs, as well as those who transfer, looking also at the characteristic patterns of inter-institutional mobility and of discontinuous college careers.

In 1966, 1,968 institutions were eligible for the ACE sample. These institutions were stratified by institutional type (2-year colleges, 4-year colleges, universities),[2] size of enrollment (2-year colleges only), and per-student expenditures[3] (4-year colleges and universities only). ACE deliberately oversampled universities and institutions in upper-end categories of enrollment and affluence, eventually inviting 371 institutions to participate in their research program (ACE Research Report, 1:1, 1966, p. 12). The actual selection of sample institutions is described by ACE:

> The institutions were initially sorted into the appropriate stratification cells, the cell members shuffled, and 371 institutions randomly chosen for the contact sample . . . The only departure from strict randomness was the deliberate inclusion in the 371 of 61 institutions that had been selected from a similar stratification design for (a) 1965 pilot study . . .An additional 25 institution, not

---

2. ACE follows the definition of institutional type used by the Office of Education. This definition is discussed in the section on institutional quality of ranking.[1]

3. This measure of affluence is the per student expenditure for "educational and general" purposes.

> included as part of the sample, were also selected either by their own request or because they were known to have educational programs of some special interest to the research staff (1:1, 1966, p. 11-12).[4]

Of the 371 institutions selected, 307[5] agreed to participate in the research program (85% of the 4-year and 60% of the 2-year institutions.)

The Carnegie enumeration began in the fall of 1968. The 1966 sample had changed in several ways by 1968:[6]

> 25 institutions dropped out of the research program; 2 institutions moved from the university to the college category, 4 colleges became universities and 2 institutions disappeared as separate entities as a result of

---

4. The institutions mentioned by ACE are those remaining in the pilot study sample of the 71 initially chosen. Of this 71, 36 institutions were selected randomly and 35 "primarily because their presidents had recently been active in various committees or commissions of the Council." (Alexander W. Astin and Robert J. Panos, "A National Research Data Bank for Higher Educarion," Educational Record, Winter, 1966, pp. 5-17.) Although the rate of participation in the pilot study would presumably be higher among these selected at least partly on the basis of anticipated cooperation, ACE notes that "there was no significant difference between the samples of 36 and 35 institutions in rate of agreement to participate." (p.12) In the final pilot study sample, "very poor, relatively small institutions of moderate size, and relatively wealthy large institutions" are substantially overrepresented. As will be evident subsequently, these biases carry over to some extent into the final ACE sample selected in 1966.

5. The sample used by ACE in 1968 was modified considerably over the 1966 sample. 135 institutions were added to the total sample and the entire sample was restratified using criteria other than those used in 1966. In order to preserve the panel, Carnegie chose to use the 1966 sample with modifications made necessary by changes in institutions from 1966 to 1968.

6. ACE reported in 1966 that 295 institutions agreed to cooperate. Subsequent descriptions of the 1966 sample list 307 institutions. It appears in fact that 309 participated, but two were not included in the published 1966 National Norms.

consolidation. In 1967, 24 additional junior colleges were added to the ACE sample due to an undersampling of junior colleges and the relatively high rate of withdrawal of junior colleges. Late in the enumeration the 24 junior colleges were added to the Carnegie sample. (see Table 1)

As Table 1 shows the response of the institutions in the ACE sample to the 1968 request for faculty and graduate student lists was excellent. Only 7 of the 310 institutions included in the sample at that time did not participate in the faculty survey-- and this in most cases was due to circumstances beyond their control. Although the number of 4-year colleges failing to participate in the graduate survey appears to be quite large, in fact only a small number of graduate students are enrolled in non-participating institutions (see Table 1, Note h).

Undergraduates

Several considerations led to a reduction of the institutional sample for the undergraduate survey from 310 institutions to 189.

1) Four-year colleges and universities which had not participated in the ACE freshman studies during the years 1966-1969 were eliminated. Two-year institutions which had not participated in both of the years 1966 and 1967 were eliminated. This was done to assure that for each of the sample institutions there would be panel data available for all respondents and that there would be adequate representation of students at all stages of their college careers.

Table 1

ACE Sample Institutions through 1968 and Responses to 1968-69 Solicitation for Faculty and Graduate Student Lists

	ACE '66 Sample	Dropped Out[g]	Reclassified In[b]	Reclassified Out[b]	Reclassified (Out)[c]	Added[d]	Total Solicited	Faculty Lists Sent	Faculty Lists Not Sent	Graduate Lists Sent	Graduate Lists Not Sent
Universities	91	13	2	4	0	1	92	80	0	79	1[i]
4-Year Colleges with Graduate Students	183	9	4	2	2	3	104	103	1[f]	78	26[h]
4-Year Colleges Without Graduate Students							82	76	0	1[h]	75
Junior Colleges	35	10	0	0	0	24 (1967)	59	44	6[e]	0	50
Total	309[a]	25	6	6	2	28	337	303	7	158	152

a. The ACE 1966 "National Norms" list is said to be based on 307 institutions. It appears however that two extra institutions were in fact surveyed in 1966 and included in the ACE panel from 1967 on.

b. The current OE/ACE classification of six institutions differs from ACE's 1966 National Norms listing. Four institutions are newly classified by OE as colleges; two are now classified as universities.

Notes for Table 1 con't

c. One institution was dropped when its lists were grouped with a neighboring and affiliated institution. The other was dropped when two institutions formally merged.

d. These additions are institutions not part of the 1966 ACE sample. Because of an undersampling of junior colleges in 1966 and because of the relatively high rate of withdrawal of junior colleges from the ACE panel (see Note G) it was decided in early January 1969 to request faculty lists from an additional 24 junior colleges, all of which had been added to the ACE panel in 1967. Because of the limited time available, five of these additional 24 were unable to send faculty lists before the questionnaire mailing data. This accounts for five of the six junior college non-responses (see Note E).

It appears that one University was accidentally asked for lists because of an error in ACE's mailing list.

e. Five junior colleges were unable to provide faculty lists in time (see note D): one withdrew from the whole ACE panel after the mailing requesting lists was made.

f. The faculty lists from another college appear to have been lost at an early stage in processing. It is classed as "not sent", although strictly speaking the list that was sent was simply not sampled.

g. Thirteen universities withdrew from the ACE 1966 panel between 1966 and late fall 1968. Three of these were persuaded by the Commission to send faculty and graduate lists for the Carnegie surveys. Nine four-year colleges withdrew (one as a result of closure); three of these sent lists. Ten two-year colleges withdrew before the first mailing, of which one sent a faculty list. Another college withdrew after the first mailing (see note E).

h. All of these four-year colleges sent faculty lists (see Note F). According to Office of Education figures, they enroll a total of 7,219 graduate students, with three institutions accounting for 66% of these. The largest college in terms of graduate enrollment, which accounts for 44% of the missing students, agreed to send a graduate student list, which did not arrive in time for the mailing of questionnaires. Several of the schools the Office of Education shows as having a small number of graduate students informed us that in fact no graduate students were enrolled at the time of the 1968 survey. Conversely, one college listed by OE as having no graduate students sent us a short list.

i. Owing to difficulties attendant on its consolidation, one institution (see note C) was unable to supply us with graduate student lists.

2) Some institutions in the ACE freshman surveys had achieved poor response rates or had distributed questionnaires in a non-systematic manner. Those institutions which, according to information provided by ACE, had achieved a response rate of less than 85% or had distributed questionnaires in a manner which was questionable (e.g., distribution at voluntary freshman orientation meetings), during any of the years 1966-1968 were excluded. Information for the ACE 1969 freshman survey was not yet available at the time of sampling for the present survey.

3) Steps 2 and 3 left 195 institutions available for the study. Six more institutions were eliminated when the name and address files delivered to National Computer Systems for mailing were discovered to be lacking either names or addresses or both for a majority of the students.

The above steps resulted in an institutional sample size of 189. These were accepted as the institutions from which the sample of four cohorts of entering students would be selected. The number and range of institutions was sufficient for our purpose of characterizing the entire range of American colleges and universities and the sampling of approximately 1,000 students from each institution would keep us within our intended sample size of approximately 2,000,000.

Professional Research Personnel

Like federal research dollars, researchers, whose principal source of support is grants and contracts, are concentrated in relatively few institutions of higher education in the United States. According to the Office of Education survey of Faculty and Other Professional Staff in Institutions of Higher Education, 1963-64, of 1431 institutions, 31 employed 61% of all researchers. Seventeen of these had complements of more than 1,000 researchers each. The remaining 14 institutions employed between 500 and 1,000 researchers each. Comparison of the Office of Education figures with a series of figures published annually in the journal Industrial Research showed quite a wide variation in the figures for each institution. On the grounds that any attempt to get at the total distribution of researchers at all institutions would be based on unreliable figures, it was decided to focus only on institutions employing large complements of researchers. A principal condideration in this decision was the cost of visiting such institutions and the relatively large number of institutions that would have had to be sampled to provide sufficient respondents.

The decision having been made to look only at institutions with large complements of researchers, the second constraint upon the sample was that it be included in the ACE sample.[7] Of the 17 institutions listed by OE survey as having more than one thousand researchers

7. Some of the major universities employing over 750 researchers were not included in the ACE sample.

each, 14 were included in the ACE sample. Of the 14 institutions reported by OE as employing between 500 and 1,000 researchers each, nine were included in the ACE sample. In all, the ACE sample included 23 of the top 31 employers of research personnel as of 1963-64.

Of the institutions that dropped out of the ACE sample three were major research-employing institutions. As substitutes for these, three institutions were selected from the ACE sample that employ between 300 and 500 researchers. The combined total of researcher employment, as recorded by the Office of Education, at the institutions dropped was 4,000 and the combined total of researchers at the three added institutions was approximately 1,000.

The total number of researchers reported by OE for the institutions in the researcher sample was about 21,000. By using a "narrow" definition of researcher the number of full-fledged research personnel was cut by half.

Although this reduces research personnel considerably for most of the institutions, researchers defined in this manner represent the core group closest to the regular faculty in research qualifications and academic orientation.

Thus, it was estimated that the 23 institutions would yield approximately 10,000 researchers as defined in the narrow sense. In fact, the number ended up at approximately 7,300.

The Enumeration

Faculty and Graduate Students

Since ACE had not heretofore studied graduate students, faculty or professional researchers, an enumeration of the relevant populations was necessary.

Requests for lists of faculty members were sent first to the ACE Representative on the participating campuses in the Fall of 1968. In many cases someone other than the Representative assisted in the preparation of the lists. The request specified that the faculty list include:

> A list of the names and departmental addresses of the regular faculty of the academic departments and professional schools of your institution. This list should include any staff member who is in charge of courses: including visiting professors, visiting lecturers, and any lecturers, instructors, etc. whether "acting" or not, who are responsible for the teaching of any course during the '68-'69 academic year creditable towards a degree (associate, bachelors, or higher). If possible, this list should not include graduate students acting as teaching assistants. If any question arises as to whether or not to include an individual, please include him.

The faculty study thus included all people other than graduate teaching assistants, giving regular courses. The population includes both visitors and part-time faculty. It also includes a small number of senior administrators who are ordinarily recruited from the ranks of academic men and whose work bears directly on the academic program. Other administrators and non-teaching personnel were removed from faculty lists whenever possible. Some clinical professors of law and engineering were excluded where they did not seem to constitute "regular faculty." But when ambiguous, the lists were inclusive rather than exclusive.

Names and local addresses of graduate students were gathered for all institutions in the ACE sample. Each sample institution was asked for

> A list of names and local, but not departmental, addresses of graduate and professional students enrolled in the departments and schools of your institution in degree programs beyond the undergraduate bachelor's degree. If the student is not in residence and does not have a local address, a home address would be appreciated. In order that we may arrive, for our own definitional purposes, at an accurate description of the kinds of students included in our sample, we would appreciate your attaching a note of the sources you have used to obtain these lists.

Computer print out and data card lists sent by sample schools were presumed to include appropriate faculty and graduate students as defined in the request letter. When faculty directories were sent, only "regular faculty not on leave" were enumerated. Professional schools were included if they did not constitute separate campuses. Branch or satellite campuses were included although lists for these campuses were less complete than for main campuses.

The graduate student lists were treated, for the purposes of enumeration and sampling, as one continuous list. To reduce processing costs three in every four names were eliminated from the graduate list during the enumeration. This list was then sampled. A final one-sixth sample was obtained by removing one third of the cases from the remaining cases. The first procedure involved a systematic sample with a random start, the second a random sample with a random start.

Although the intention was to do a census of the faculty, a 6 in 7 sample was drawn from the final faculty lists to reduce costs.

The enumeration indicated that 116,115 faculty members were employed in the participating sample institutions and that 310,088 graduate students were enrolled in the graduate institutions. (See Table 2..)

Table 2

	Number of Participating Institutions.	Total Faculty & Grads. in Participating Insti.	Enumerated Faculty & Graduates	Number of Questionnaires sent after final sampling
Faculty	303	116,115	116,115*	100,290
Graduates	158	310,088	77,522*	51,682

* All faculty and one fourth of the graduate students were enumerated; the final samples included 6/7 of the listed faculty and 2/3 of the listed graduate students.

Undergraduates

Instead of enumerating all the undergraduates in the 189 undergraduate sample institutions, we drew the sample of individuals from among the respondents to the ACE freshman surveys in those institutions. Respondents to the ACE surveys had been asked to give a "permanent" address at which they could be reached. ACE was instructed by us to sample these names and addresses randomly within cohorts in a manner to attain a maximum number of individuals per institution of 1,000, distributed among the 4 cohorts as follows:

1966	Freshman Cohort	300
1967	Freshman Cohort	275
1968	Freshman Cohort	225
1969	Freshman Cohort	200
	Total	1,000

When a cohort for an institution totaled fewer than the assigned maximum, all the students in that cohort were to be selected.

These maximum cohort sizes were chosen so as to insure that a sufficient absolute number of respondents would be available for each cohort, since response rates were expected to be inversely related to the time elapsed since the individual's address had been acquired. The differential sampling rates were to be adjusted by weighting.

Questionnaires were mailed just prior to Christmas, 1969, with the aim of reaching the sampled individuals at their homes during the Christmas recess.

Upon receiving the complete data files for all sampled individuals, whether they had responded or not (non-respondents were represented only by ACE freshman data), we discovered that ACE had not adhered to the sampling quotas which we had established for each cohort. As far as we were able to determine, these quotas had been exceeded in all institutions which had more students than the maximum specified by our quotas. The largest discrepancy was 50% over the specified quota. Examination of the actual number of students sampled per cohort per institution indicates that the discrepancy between our instructions and the actual number of cases sampled was probably due to an error in the computer program for sampling the institutional files, which resulted in a higher rate per institution than had been intended. This is in no way serious, since our weighting procedures necessitate weighting by institution prior to making any other adjustments.

Professional Research Personnel

The criteria used to define researchers in the Office of Education and Industrial Research studies must be interpreted in a "broad" sense to include, in addition to "full-fledged" researchers, many personnel having auxiliary or trainee status. For the purpose of this study, the following definition of researchers was used: 'Persons appointed to perform research in positions other than regular "ladder" faculty positions, who are capable of independent research, or scholarly work as evidenced by their possession of the Ph.D. degree or equivalent research accomplishment.'

Site visits were made to all but one of the 23 institutions in the researcher sample. Interviews were conducted with academic and other administrative personnel with a view to determining the best mode of

identifying and collecting names and departmental addresses of persons in non-faculty research positions. Four sources of such information were eventually used - some of them exclusively for some institutions, and for other institutions, combinations of these sources were used. The sources were: printout from payroll tapes; printouts or listings from records in personnel offices; listings assembled from academic catalogs; and finally, in one institution, listings from the campus telephone book. The initial period of the enumeration was thus carried out by gaining the cooperation of administrative or research personnel in order to identify those researchers necessary to this study. Although in most cases information was easily obtained, some bias in the sample remains.

The most serious bias in the types of researchers that were ennumerated is an undercount of the kind of post doctoral fellows who come, particularly to the large universities, without any formal appointment (often necessitated by receiving a paycheck through the payroll system and who essentially bring their fellowship money with them). It is safe to say that none of the large institutions had any regular administrative methods for keeping tabs on such people. The magnitude of the group thus missed may range up to 20% or so of the total at some institutions. Richard Curtis' study of "Post-doctoral Education in the United States" conducted by the National Science Foundation provides some clue as to the magnitude of this bias. The 1967 study identified some 13,300 post doctoral appointments in universities, 25% of which were individuals on true nationally competitive fellowships; the others being hired on various titles on project funds or as trainees. Institutions seem to

vary randomly in the extent which they press for appointing all their research personnel to research associated type (i.e., staff) appointments or the extent to which they are willing to lend the titles "fellow" to these people.

Questionnaire Development

During the fall of 1968 work on Questionnaire development was completed for the faculty and graduate studies and pre-testing was begun. Because the questionnaires were to be machine readable, exacting care with the lay-out had to be taken as well as concern with substantive issues. Although there is some small random error in the use of an optical scanner to read this type of document, it is more accurate and economical than any other method of large scale data collection.[8] Four versions of each questionnaire were ultimately constructed. Pre-testing was carried out on the two final versions. Pre-testing was somewhat limited because it was impossible to produce an interim machine-readable questionnaire. Most of the pre-testing was done, therefore, by interview.

---

8. The error is estimated at less than one half of one percent.

III

The second major period of work, 2/1/69 to 3/1/70 covers the completion of the enumeration of individuals in the sample for all the surveys, the mailing of the questionnaires, and limited preliminary analyses of data from all but the undergraduate survey. The work for this period was funded by the Office of Education and the Carnegie Commission. The Office of Education funds were used primarily for data collection, computer costs and the intensive follow-up of non-respondents. The initial grant was awarded February 1, 1969 to run for one year.

Data Collection

Faculty and Graduate Students

Printing and mailing of the questionnaires for the four major studies was handled through National Computer Systems, Minneapolis, Minn. The lay-out and printing of the faculty and graduate questionnaires was accomplished during the early spring, 1969. Name and address files were given to NCS and great care was taken to insure the anonymity of all respondents. Faculty questionnaires were mailed the second week of March over a period of five days. Graduate questionnaires were mailed the third week of March in three days. Follow-up postcards were mailed out approximately a week after the mailing of the questionnaires.

Considerable effort was taken to assure the highest possible response rate. Two weeks after the mailing of the postcards a follow-up letter was sent to all non-respondents. Six weeks after the original mailing a second questionnaire was sent to the remaining non-respondents

(See Table 3). As Table 3 indicates most people responded to the initial questionnaire. Sixteen-hundred and fifty faculty members responded to the follow-up letter and an additional 5,778 individuals responded after receiving the second questionnaire. Thirteen hundred and fifty (1350) graduate students responded after the follow-up letter, 3,091 after receiving a second questionnaire. Slightly more than 8% of the faculty and graduate samples responded as a result of the three additional mailings.

Table 3

Faculty and Graduate Participation in Followup Study

	Number of Follow-up Postcards Sent	Number of Respondents Receiving Follow up Letters	Number of Respondents Receiving 2nd Questionnaire	Total Returned Questionnaires
Faculty	100,290	47,580	45,930	60,028
Graduates	51,682	23,160	21,810	32,963

Undergraduates and Professional Research Personnel

Questionnaires were mailed to the researchers a little over a month after the original faculty and graduate mailings. Most of the respondents had returned their questionnaires by the first week in June, but follow-up letters were mailed to the non-respondents the second week in July to increase the response. Out of the 7300 researchers sampled, we received 3729 useable questionnaires for a response rate of 51%.

The layout and printing of the undergraduate questionnaire was completed in November 1969. The questionnaires were mailed out a month later to reach the students during the Christmas recess. Follow-up post cards urging the completion of the questionnaire were mailed out a week later to everyone

in the 171,525 undergraduate sample. By our cutoff date we had received 70,772 useable questionnaires for a response rate of 41% (by cohort: 1966-38%; 1967-39%; 1968-44%; 1969-46%).

Data Utilization Activities

Protection of Respondents' Anonymity

This was accomplished by removing from the master tape the links between the names of the respondents and their addresses and the serial numbers used for analytical identification. The names were wholly obliterated, preventing any inadvertant disclosure of the responses of individuals. In the case of the faculty, the addresses were returned, sorted and recoded into the sixty-nine departmental categories which were included in the questionnaire. These recoded addresses, in most cases the name of a department, were merged with the respondent's data record and used as a supplement for the responden 's self-reported teaching department, especially useful for those who failed to answer the whole of the question on that matter. At the same time a master file was created for merging with the data files. These files contained: for the faculty only, the recoded departmental mailing address; for all respondents, indications of when the respondent returned his completed questionnaire, and a system for cross-referencing all the different serial numbers used for any respondent, thus allowing the study to accumulate information on non-respondents, and to eliminate duplicate responses.

Quality Control of Data

Quality control of the data from NCS took several forms. After the coding specifications were sent to NCS a sample of two hundred questionnaires for each of the faculty and graduate studies was coded by hand in Berkeley and a tape prepared to be checked against the machine coded tapes for the same questionnaire prepared by National Computer Systems. Several procedures were used to check the accuracy of the

machine coding: marginal distributions were compared, contingencies built into the coding were checked, and finally a column by column check was carried out. Dummy questionnaires were created to check coding possibilities not covered in the two hundred questionnaires. As a result of this, the proportion of errors in the final data tapes was very small. The same process was later used to check the quality of the undergraduate and researcher data.

Programs for contingency checking were developed for "cleaning" the data to insure that instructions were followed by respondents and to assure that the analysis would at all times examine only those respondents to whom a particular question was intended to apply.

Study of Respondent Bias

During this period an intensive study of faculty and graduate non-respondents was undertaken to learn who they were in order to be able to properly weight for any response bias. After approximately fifty percent of the sample had responded random samples of 2000 cases (both faculty and graduate) were selected for an intensive follow-up. Of these, approximately half had responded by the time the follow-up began. The remainder were first sent an additional questionnaire and then telephoned. The phoning operation had three major functions: First to identify respondents who were either no longer available or ineligible, and therefore not genuinely part of our survey; second, to encourage genuine respondents to return their completed questionnaires; and third, failing that, to elicit from them over the phone responses to seven questions which would give us valuable data which would allow us to characterize non-respondents for the subsequent weighting operation.

On the first call, telephone interviewers were instructed to encourage the respondent to complete and return the questionnaire. If the respondent agreed to do so, the interview was terminated. If the respondent indicated that he did not intend to complete the questionnaire he was asked a brief list of questions identical to items on the questionnaire. After a lapse of some weeks, those respondents who had not completed the questionnaire but who had indicated willingness to do so were called again. On the second call they were again encouraged to complete the questionnaire but were asked the brief list of questions whether or not they agreed to complete the questionnaire.

Of those selected for the graduate telephone sample, 1543 completed the graduate questionnaire, 173 others answered the brief list of questions, 151 could not be located. Of those selected for the faculty telephone sample, 1512 completed the questionnaire, 214 answered the brief list of questions, 87 could not be located and 59 were not followed-up because of a computer error. Over 85% of the people in both samples responded either to the full questionnaire or to the additional questions during the phone interview (See Non-Response Bias pp.49- 73).

Development of an Institutional File

An institutional file for all colleges and universities in the United States was created. It is based on information gathered from the American Council on Education, from the HEGIS tapes sent to us by the Office of Education, and from a variety of published sources not available on magnetic tape. This file is

used for general descriptive purposes and has been added to the data tapes for uses in data analysis. It was essential to the development of an accurate weighting scheme. A major part of the individual weight is a function of the institutional weight.

IV

The fourth major period of work, 3/1/70 to 1/1/71, was taken up in the development of weighting schemes for the faculty and graduate studies, analysis of response bias, creation of data samples and production of weighted and unweighted marginal tabulations.

Weighting

Faculty and Graduate

Disproportionate sampling and the failure of some institutions to respond to the request for lists required that cooperating institutions be differentially weighted. As a first step in the computation of these weights, all institutions were assigned to their 1966 cells (on the basis of information supplied by ACE).[10] Table 4 summarizes this procedure. It shows that all but 228 of the 2843 institutions listed by the U.S. Office of Education (data tape on Opening Fall Enrollment, 1968), (HEGIS II) would have been eligible for inclusion and could be located within the 1966 scheme based on institutional type and affluence or enrollment. The 228 ineligible institutions contain only slightly more than 2 percent of the faculty and less than 4 percent of the graduate students in American colleges and universities. The bulk of ineligible faculty and graduate students teach or are enrolled in 123 theological seminaries or in 31 independent graduate or professional schools.

Branch or satellite campuses of institutions included in the ACE sampling frame were assigned to the sampling cell occupied by the main campus. Although in some cases the branch campus lists were provided either directly or by the main campus, both faculty and graduate students at such branch campuses are in general underrepresented in the sample. Since we have no way of distinguishing between main and branch campus respondents, there is no way we can exclude them from the sample or adjust for their lesser likelihood of appearing in the sample by adjusting

---

10. For its own surveys, ACE no longer relies on its 1966 stratification scheme. For a summary and justification of the various stratification dimensions used by ACE over the course of its research program, see Alan E. Bayer et al., Users' Manual: ACE Higher Education Data Bank. Washington: American Council on Education, 1969.

Table 4 -A

Assignment of Institutions to 1966 ACE Cells
With Faculty Institutional Weights

ACE 1966 Cell		ENROLLMENT	Universe # of Inst.	Universe Faculty Number	Sample # of Inst.	Sample Faculty Number	Faculty Weight
Public 2-Year Colleges	1	Low	172	6108	6	390	15.66
	2	.	182	10621	7	447	23.76
	3	.	175	17567	7	593	29.62
	4	.	54	9068	5	645	14.06
	5	High	50	12352	5	1457	8.48
Private 2-Year Colleges	6	Low	229	6824	10	353	19.33
	7	.	--	--	--	--	19.33
	8	.	36	2664	4	343	7.77
	9	High	--	--	--	--	7.77
		AFFLUENCE					
Universities	10	Unknown					
	11	Low	15	6780	4	2691	2.52
	12	.	10	3715	5	2418	1.54
	13	.	47	18079	5	5815	3.11
	14	.	52	20306	12	9401	2.16
	15	.	18	13382	5	4362	3.07
	16	.	69	36638	13	19060	1.92
	17	.	32	22036	23	18512	1.19
	18	.	44	19177	8	8146	2.35
	19	High	76	67775	26	36316	1.87
4-Year Colleges	20	Unknown					
	21	Low	449	37497	30	2818	13.31
	22	.	248	34436	20	3010	11.44
	23	.	250	34435	22	2241	15.37
	24	.	175	30891	26	4769	6.48
	25	.	84	11747	19	2091	5.62
	26	.	56	8753	25	3799	2.30
	27	.	29	5078	12	2401	2.11
	28	.	24	3369	9	1733	1.94
	29	High	39	6998	18	3160	2.21
Eligible Total			2615	446296+	326*	136971	[3.26]
No Undergraduates	30	Inelgible Institutions	8	918	0	--	--
Seminaries	31		123	3137	0	--	--
Professional Schools	32		31	4965	0	--	--
Freshman Class Students	30 33		66	1302	0	--	--
TOTAL INELIGIBLE			228	10322	0	--	--
GRAND TOTAL			2843	456618	x	x	x

+97.74% of total

*The number of institutions given here includes branch campuses counted as separate institutions by OE. This number includes the 303 institutions indicated in Table 1 plus the branch campus.

Table 4-B

Assignment of Institutions to 1966 ACE Cells
With Graduate Student Institutional Weights

ACE 1966 Cell		ENROLLMENT	Universe # of Inst.	Universe Graduate Numbers	Sample # of Inst.	Sample Graduate Numbers	Graduate Weight
Public 2-Year Colleges	1	Low	172				
	2	.	182				
	3	.	175				
	4	.	54				
	5	High	50				
Private 2-Year Colleges	6	Low	229				
	7	.	--				
	8	.	36				
	9	High	--				
		AFFLUENCE					
Universities	10	Unknown					
	11	Low	15	27447	4	9403	2.92
	12	.	10	14468	5	12147	1.19
	13	.	47	43664	5	15202	2.87
	14	.	52	73872	11	23486	3.15
	15	.	18	42569	5	12320	3.46
	16	.	69	121747	13	60904	2.00
	17	.	32	71985	18	57486	1.25
	18	.	44	69290	7	31898	2.17
	19	High	76	187622	18	93878	2.00
4-Year Colleges	20	Unknown					
	21	Low	697	119903	18	6446	18.60
	22	.	--	--	--	--	18.60
	23	.	425	151499	17	12928	11.72
	24	.	--	--	--	--	11.72
	25	.	84	23235	6	2116	10.98
	26	.	56	20119	15	4932	4.08
	27	.	29	13240	7	8803	1.50
	28	.	24	8178	6	3794	2.16
	29	High	39	13853	10	6246	2.22
ELIGIBLE TOTAL			2615	1002691++	165	361989	[2.77]
No Undergraduates	30	Ineligible Institutions	8	4432	0	--	--
Seminaries	31		123	17813	0	--	--
Professional Schools	32		31	13257	0	--	--
Freshman Class 30 Students	33		66	2976	0	--	--
TOTAL INELIGIBLE			228	38478	0	--	--
GRAND TOTAL			2843	1041169	x	x	x

++96.30% of total

the magnitude of their weights. (The bias is not large. About 6 percent (61,000) of all graduate students are enrolled at such campuses. The names of 5,500 of these were on lists sent to the Carnegie Commission.)

Initial assignment of institutions to the 1966 ACE cells revealed that the "unknown" categories of affluence for both universities and colleges were greatly undersampled. Rather than assign very large weights to these undersampled institutions, we attempted to distribute them over the other sampling cells on the basis of affluence information not available to ACE in 1966. All universities were easily reassigned on the basis of current information. Although per-student expenditure information was still unavailable for many four-year colleges, those for whom such information had become available were generally poor. We therefore combined the "unknown" category with the lowest category of affluence in the case of faculty and with the two lowest four-year college affluence cells in the case of graduate students.[11]

Finally, two faculty junior college cells and one graduate student four-year college cell were sufficiently undersampled that we considered it necessary for purposes of weighting to combine them with adjacent and much better sampled cells.

Once these operations were performed, we determined the total number of graduate students in each cell from enrollment information provided by the Office of Education[12]; faculty numbers were obtained from the

---

11. "Faculty" institutions are of course more numerous than "graduate student" institutions in the four-year college category. Undersampling problems were thus less serious for the faculty than for the graduate student sample.

12. Magnetic tapes provided by the Office of Education.

College Blue Book, World Almanac, and ACE's American Universities and Colleges.[13] Table 4 shows the number of faculty and graduate students in each cell in the universe of colleges and universities and in sample institutions. It also shows the base institutional weight by dividing the number in the universe by the number in the sample.

Once these institutional weights had been computed, we were in a position to check for possible bias in the sample. The first check was on institutional quality. The weights were first used to estimate the total number of faculty and graduate students in each of several quality strata. These estimates were then compared with the actual number derived from both published sources and data tapes provided by the Office of Education. The Office of Education projected that there were 841,622 graduate students registered in Master's, Doctoral, or First Professional Degree programs in 1968. The remaining graduate students are in non degree or special programs. The projected total includes only graduate students in eligible institutions and does not include students in autonomous graduate institutions such as theological seminaries, independent medical or law schools, or graduate institutions that have no undergraduates. The results for graduate students are shown in Table 5.

---

13. The College Blue Book, 1969/70 -- 13th Edition, New York: CCM Information Corporation, 1969. (This edition contains faculty figures for 1968-1969) World Almanac, 1969, Newspaper Enterprise Assoc., 1969.

American Universities and Colleges -- 10th Edition, Washington D.C. ACE, 1968.

Table 5

Actual Population of Graduate Students in Quality Strata and Number of Graduate Students Estimated from 1966 ACE Cells

Quality Ranking	Actual Population	Categories Estimates from ACE Strata	%Estimate Over or Under Actual Population
Universities (Total)	652,664	652,663	
High	172,330	226,983	(+) 31.7%
Medium	258,232	231,134	(-) 10.5%
Low	222,102	194,546	(-) 12.4%
Colleges (Total)	350,027	350,027	
High	60,791	78,190	(+) 28.6%
Medium	120,682	114,927	(-) 4.8%
Low	168,554	156,910	(-) 6.9%

Table 5 shows that high-quality institutions, both colleges and universities, were substantially overrepresented in the original ACE sample. Since, as noted in an earlier footnote, ACE departed from a strictly random procedure by including in the final sample 71 pilot study institutions (many of whom were initially selected by non-random means), and since this pilot study was known to overrepresent high-quality institutions, all pilot study institutions were eliminated from the sample and institutional weights recomputed for only those institutions selected according to a strictly random procedure. This approach did not improve the weights.

Elimination of pilot-study institutions reduced only slightly the overall bias toward high-quality institutions in the sample. Since the loss in sample breadth appeared to be greater than the gain in reduction of bias, we returned pilot study institutions and adjusted for bias within the limits provided by the sample. After the extent of bias

Table 6

Correction Factors for Quality and Control Bias in 1966 ACE Sample -- Faculty and Graduate Students

Quality Universities	Public Institutions	
	Faculty	Graduate Students
High	.987	.793
Medium	1.273	1.190
Low	1.180	1.094
4-Year Colleges		
High	.973	.708
Medium	1.001	2.078
Low	1.679	1.021
Junior Colleges	.990	--

Quality Universities	Private Institutions	
	Faculty	Graduate Students
High	.695	.731
Medium	.781	.978
Low	1.129	1.222
4-Year Colleges		
High	.872	.951
Medium	.511	.500
Low	1.059	1.220
Junior Colleges	1.067	--

with respect to geographical location, size, and public or private control as well as quality had been determined, it was decided that it was both necessary and feasible to adjust the sample weights simultaneously for quality and type of control. These adjustments or correction factors for the various quality-control categories are shown in Table 6. (Correction factors are the ratios of the actual cell population to the cell population estimated from 1966 ACE strata (See Table 5. The ratio-adjustments were made within quality-control cells rather than original sampling cells. Although this facilitates the weighting procedure it introduces minor distortion). A correction factor of .500 indicates that the estimated number of faculty (or graduate students) in the cell is twice as large as the actual number of faculty and that responses of faculty in this cell will be reduced by one-half in estimating the distribution of responses in the population as a whole.

The weights and corrections to this point adjust the data for disproportionate sampling of institutions. The data must also be adjusted for three additional sources of variation: institutional non-response (the lists of faculty and graduate students sent to the Carnegie Commission were variably complete); sampling of individuals from the lists (in the case of faculty, a systematic sample of six-sevenths, secured by removing every seventh case from the list and retaining the remainder in the sample; in the case of graduate students, a systematic sample of one-sixth obtained by selecting every fourth case and subsequently removing every third case from those selected); and, finally, individual nonresponse. All of these variations are taken into account when we divide the total number of faculty or graduate students in an institution (according to published--i.e., independent information) by the number of faculty or graduate student respondents

in the institution. This procedure assumes that the lists provided by the institution are representative of all persons in the institution; it also assumes that respondents within an institution are representative of non-respondents within that institution.

Extreme graduate weights were reduced by combining low-response (or incomplete list) institutions with institutions similar with respect to quality, size, type of control, and geographical region. All in all, seven small institutions were combined with other institutions for this purpose.

The final weights used for the tabulations in this report are thus an attempt to take into account the sampling of institutions, bias with respect to quality and control, sampling of individuals, and two types of nonresponse. These weights range in magnitude from 1.34 to 103.09 for faculty and from 0.82 to 1314.94 for graduate students. The actual distribution of weights is shown in Table 7.

Of 51,682 questionnaires sent to graduate students enrolled in participating institutions, 32,963 or 64.0 percent were eventually returned in usable form.[14] Of the 100,290 questionnaires sent to faculty, 60,028 or 59.8 percent were returned. While these return rates are excellent for a mail questionnaire, the problem of nonresponse bias remains.

---

14. An additional 650 (or 1.3 percent of the total) questionnaires were returned to the Commission. Of these 378 were determined to be undergraduates and thus ineligible for the survey. Ninety-three questionnaires were returned with the identification number defaced such that institutional affiliation could not be determined. The remaining usable questionnaires were duplicates of questionnaires already returned. One hundred and seventy graduate students returned blank questionnaires.

Table 7

Distribution of Final Weights Adjusted for Quality, Control, and Nonresponse -- Faculty and Graduate Students

Weight	Number of Institutions: Faculty	Graduate Students
0.0-4.9*	111	3
5.0-9.9	52	3
10.0-14.9	25	22
15.0-19.9	22	20
20.0-24.9	26	15
25.0-29.9	15	11
30.0-34.9	19	9
35.0-39.9	10	11
40.0-49.9	11	3
50.0-99.9	11	27
100.0-199.9	1	16
200.0-299.9	-	4
300.0-399.9	-	3
400.0-499.9	-	-
500.0-999.9	-	4
1000.0-or greater**	-	4
TOTALS	303	155***

*Minimum weight, faculty = 1.34 ; graduate students = .82 .

**Maximum weight, faculty = 103.09 ; graduate students = 1314.94.

***Three four-year colleges (from which a total of eight graduate students were sampled) were eliminated at the last stage of weighting because of non-response.

Several methods for estimating the extent of such bias are possible. We chose to compare the obtained sample with a smaller sample intensively followed-up, and this process is described in the Non-response section on pp. 49-73.

Undergraduate

The undergraduate data posed several weighting problems which were not found in the other studies. The first was the problem of defining the universe we were weighting toward. In the undergraduate study, the weighted sample predicts the number of students who entered institutions of higher education during the Fall of years 1966, 1967, 1968 and 1969 with the following limitations:

1. All institutions included were accredited in 1966 and listed by U.S. Office of Education in their publication Opening Fall Enrollment in Higher Education. (Part A, Summary Data) Thus, newly founded or recently accredited institutions were likely to be excluded.

2. Those institutions which had an opening fall enrollment of less than 30 students in 1966 were eliminated.

3. The enrollment data were derived from tapes supplied by the Office of Education to the Carnegie Commission. Inconsistancies in institution I.D. numbers, differences between the tape content and published data, errors in reading tapes by the computer, and the omission of newly founded or accredited institutions led to small differences between our total enrollment figures and those published by the Office of Education. See Table 8.

Table 8
Entering Undergraduate Enrollment Data

	1966	1967	1968	1969
Our Total	1,535,756	1,554,218	1,711,446	1,737,675
Office of Education Total	1,565,564	1,652,317	1,907,938	1,983,525

4. The Office of Education changed their definition of entering student during the four years for which we collected data. The figures given above are as follows:

1966 "First time students" both full-time and part-time.

1967 "First time Freshmen students" both full-time and part-time.

1968 "First time students working toward B.A. degree" and "First time students not working toward a B.A. degree" both part-time and full-time.

1969 "First time Freshmen students" both full-time and part-time.

It must be pointed out that the weights do not account for the total number of students currently in American higher education, but rather for the number of students who entered during one of the four years. Because this is true, separate weights had to be calculated for each cohort of entering students. The method of calculating the weights is as follows:

1. Since we sampled a quota of students from each institution, and institutions differed in their response rate, we first calculated an INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSE WEIGHT which is the ratio of the number of students in the institution to the number who actually responded. This weight accounts for both different sampling rates and differential response rates.

$$\text{INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSE} = \frac{\text{Total Entering Students}}{\text{Students Who Responded}}$$

2. Since the sample of institutions was drawn from the universe according to 29 sampling strata, we next calculated a STRATUM WEIGHT which represents the ratio of the number of students in institution included in the stratum to the number of students in sample institutions also in that stratum. Because private institutions were heavily oversampled and

public institutions were heavily undersampled we calculated strata weights separrately for public and private institutions in each stratum (See Table 9). Further, since all strata were not evenly represented by institutions, we found it necessary to combine several neighboring strata to achieve more stable weights. The strata combined were: Public = (1,2, and 3), (4 and 5), (11 and 12), (18 and 19), (20 and 21), (26, 27, 28, and 29). Private = (6,7,8 and 9), (15 and 16), (18 and 19), (20 and 21). In 1969 we also had to combine: Public = (14,15),(20,21,22). Private = (15, 16, 17).

$$\text{STRATUM WEIGHT} = \frac{\text{Total Students in all Institutions in Stratum}}{\text{Students in Sample Institutions in Stratum}}$$

3. An individual student's weight was the product of his institution's response weight and the appropriate stratum weight. However, we found that this weight, while it correctly predicted the distribution of students in the universe according to the sampling cells, failed to predict their distribution according to the quality of the institution. When we observed the distribution of students by the quality of their institution and compared this to the distribution of all the students who entered higher education, we found that there was need for an adjustment in the weight so that quality would be correctly predicted. The adjustments for quality (calculated separately for public and private institutions) are the ratio between the actual number of students in a quality cell and our estimate based on the previous weights. The adjustment factors are shown in Table 10.

$$\text{ADJUSTMENT FACTOR} = \frac{\text{Actual Students by Institutional Quality}}{\text{Estimated Students by Institutional Quality}}$$

Table 9

Strata Weights

ACE 1966 Cell		ENROLLMENT	1966 Public	1966 Private	1967 Public	1967 Private	1968 Public	1968 Private	1969 Public	1969 Private
Public 2-Year Colleges	1	Low	110.56		106.79		126.71		160.59	
	2	.	110.56		106.79		126.71		160.59	
	3	.	110.56		106.79		126.71		160.59	
	4	.	13.45		15.95		18.17		22.66	
	5	High	13.45		15.95		18.17		22.66	
Private 2-Year Colleges	6	Low		17.92		17.87		19.17		28.15
	7	.		17.92		17.87		19.17		28.15
	8	.		17.92		17.87		19.17		28.15
	9	High		17.92		17.87		19.17		28.15
		AFFLUENCE								
	10	Unknown								
	11	Low	9.43	3.09	8.38	3.42	13.92	2.32	9.02	4.48
	12	.	9.43	1.23	8.38	1.15	13.92	1.15	9.02	1.18
	13	.	7.55	1.61	8.85	1.67	10.52	1.74	9.26	2.07
Universities	14	.	4.51	3.08	5.17	2.85	5.35	1.12	6.29	12.72
	15	.	3.01	6.41	3.42	6.58	3.72	6.97	6.29	6.90
	16	.	3.58	6.41	3.32	6.58	4.44	6.97	3.52	6.90
	17	.	3.61	4.21	3.55	3.42	3.10	3.74	3.14	6.90
	18	.	15.90	3.67	12.54	3.83	17.68	3.48	16.94	4.46
	19	High	15.90	3.67	12.54	3.83	17.68	3.48	16.94	4.46
	20	Unknown	80.60	16.57	87.67	15.61	86.27	15.20	133.59	16.31
	21	Low	80.60	16.57	87.67	15.61	86.27	15.20	133.59	16.31
	22	.	53.00	9.94	44.66	9.74	37.79	10.33	133.59	11.52
4-Year Colleges	23	.	31.50	14.15	35.22	13.48	35.33	13.50	32.46	16.44
	24	.	8.79	6.41	7.94	6.14	8.25	6.35	7.15	6.26
	25	.	9.97	5.41	10.40	5.40	10.95	5.04	10.90	5.12
	26	.	3.58	4.99	3.37	4.55	3.04	4.06	5.24	4.71
	27	.	3.58	4.07	3.37	4.42	3.04	4.37	5.24	4.71
	28	.	3.58	2.44	3.37	2 72	3.04	2.48	5.24	3.19
	29	High	2.58	2.14	3.37	2.02	3.04	2.03	5.24	2.47

Table 10

Adjustment Factors

Type and Quality	1966 Public	1966 Private	1967 Public	1967 Private	1968 Public	1968 Private	1969 Public	1969 Private
University:								
High Quality	2.46	0.63	2.52	0.63	1.89	0.66	2.32	0.79
Med. Quality	0.74	1.00	0.75	1.07	0.77	1.07	0.76	0.75
Low Quality	1.17	1.34	1.15	1.33	1.33	1.30	1.15	1.39
4-Year College:								
High Quality	0.85	0.73	0.91	0.79	0.95	0.79	0.98	0.76
Med. Quality	0.58	0.77	0.59	0.78	0.58	0.75	0.32	0.69
Low Quality	1.36	1.24	1.36	1.22	1.41	1.25	5.84	1.36
Junior College:								
All Qualities	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00

4. The product of the earlier student's weight and the appropriate adjustment factor produces the final weight used in this study. Table 11 shows the distribution of the weights by sampling strata and by institutional control, giving the highest and the lowest weight within each category of institutions.

WEIGHT = (Institutional Response) x (Stratum Weight) x (Adjustment Factor)

5. In order to verify that the weights were computed correctly we checked to see that our estimates and the total sample were the same. Table 12 shows our estimate for the type of institutional control and Table 13 shows our estimate for the institutional quality. The small differences are due to rounding error. The use of the adjustment factor successfully corrected for institutional quality, but it changed the distribution by original sampling strata. The extent of the strata error is shown in Table 14. There is nothing we can do about this since we choose to sacrifice accuracy by strata to gain accuracy by quality which is much more important to our analysis.

Table 11

Range of Final Weights by Year

ACE 1966 Cell		ENROLLMENT	1966 Public low	1966 Public high	1966 Private low	1966 Private high	1966 # of Inst. Pub.	1966 # of Inst. Priv.	1967 Public low	1967 Public high	1967 Private low	1967 Private high	1967 # of Inst. Pub.	1967 # of Inst. Priv.
Public	1	Low	380	1095	--	--	4	0	380	1133	--	--	4	0
2-Year	2	.	1240	1240	--	--	1	0	806	806	--	--	1	0
Colleges	3	.	--	--	--	--	0	0	--	--	--	--	0	0
	4	.	310	447	--	--	2	0	455	471	--	--	2	0
	5	High	2306	882	--	--	2	0	1503	1666	--	--	2	0
Private	6	Low	--	--	39	107	0	5	--	--	41	112	0	5
2-Year	7	.	--	--	--	--	0	0	--	--	--	--	0	0
Colleges	8	.	--	--	169	241	0	3	--	--	152	224	0	3
	9	High	--	--	--	--	0	0	--	--	123	123	0	1
		AFFLUENCE												
	10	Unknown	--	--	--	--	0	0	--	--	--	--	0	0
	11	Low	138	138	11	51	1	2	--	--	10	46	0	2
	12	.	--	--	28	38	0	2	--	--	18	19	0	2
	13	.	238	238	20	157	1	3	167	167	17	187	1	3
Univer-	14	.	235	101	31	63	3	3	99	190	31	58	3	3
sities	15	.	148	148	19	87	1	2	230	230	23	125	1	2
	16	.	76	220	--	--	5	0	31	155	--	--	5	0
	17	.	14	120	54	54	7	1	11	105	43	43	7	1
	18	.	--	--	18	21	0	2	--	--	23	29	0	2
	19	High	223	238	10	34	2	5	169	278	13	51	2	5
	20	Unknown	--	--	58	65	0	5	--	--	34	88	0	5
	21	Low	874	874	23	141	1	14	959	959	24	130	1	14
	22	.	249	497	18	105	2	10	277	553	20	92	2	10
	23	.	205	296	23	86	2	14	199	368	24	98	2	14
4-Year	24	.	62	109	11	58	5	16	69	108	10	44	5	17
Colleges	25	.	20	118	8	32	3	13	18	79	9	28	3	13
	26	.	17	24	6	20	4	14	11	29	7	14	5	14
	27	.	--	--	7	24	0	5	--	--	6	15	0	5
	28	.	--	--	4	34	0	8	--	--	7	28	0	8
	29	High	--	--	2	7	0	13	--	--	2	9	0	13

Table 11(cont'd.)

ACE 1966 Cell		ENROLLMENT	1968 Public low	1968 Public high	1968 Private low	1968 Private high	1968 # of Inst. Pub.	1968 # of Inst. Priv.	1969 Public low	1969 Public high	1969 Private low	1969 Private high	1969 # of Inst. Pub.	1969 # of Inst. Priv.
Public 2-Year Colleges	1	Low	439	1766	--	--	4	0	856	2129	--	--	3	0
	2	.	841	841	--	--	1	0	--	--	--	--	0	0
	3	.	--	--	--	--	0	0	--	--	--	--	0	0
	4	.	395	1651	--	--	2	0	514	514	--	--	1	0
	5	High	1061	1855	--	--	2	0	2458	1763	--	--	2	0
Private 2-Year Colleges	6	Low	--	--	40	68	0	5	--	--	58	128	0	5
	7	.	--	--	--	--	0	0	--	--	--	--	0	0
	8	.	--	--	179	300	0	3	--	--	229	239	0	2
	9	High	--	--	--	--	0	0	--	--	--	--	0	0
		AFFLUENCE												
Univer-sities	10	Unknown	--	--	--	--	0	0	--	--	--	--	0	0
	11	Low	227	227	7	34	1	2	224	224	778	778	1	1
	12	.	--	--	16	21	0	2	--	--	15	35	0	2
	13	.	240	240	22	239	1	3	323	323	31	391	1	2
	14	.	265	135	36	87	3	3	186	322	104	104	3	1
	15	.	151	151	36	186	1	2	--	--	136	34	0	2
	16	.	70	287	--	--	4	0	66	314	--	--	5	0
	17	.	14	135	60	60	7	1	19	155	--	--	6	0
	18	.	--	--	23	31	0	2	2893	2893	--	--	1	0
	19	High	310	311	18	46	2	5	269	269	28	150	1	5
4-Year Colleges	20	Unknown	--	--	37	68	0	5	--	--	23	134	0	4
	21	Low	1306	1306	21	145	1	14	--	--	27	124	0	13
	22	.	377	596	24	83	2	10	635	635	18	153	1	9
	23	.	182	423	19	93	2	14	233	612	23	106	2	13
	24	.	77	123	11	86	5	17	70	920	11	54	5	17
	25	.	23	94	9	23	3	13	12	49	9	21	3	13
	26	.	14	43	4	19	5	14	11	93	5	35	3	13
	27	.	--	--	7	14	0	5	--	--	7	15	0	4
	28	.	--	--	5	27	0	8	--	--	7	46	0	7
	29	High	--	--	3	12	0	13	--	--	3	14	0	12

Table 12

Verification of Weights by Control

	1966		1967	
	Estimated	Actual	Estimated	Actual
PUBLIC	1,104,607	1,104,611	1,134,608	1,134,612
PRIVATE	431,137	431,145	419,602	419,606
	1968		1969	
	Estimated	Actual	Estimated	Actual
PUBLIC	1,281,144	1,281,148	1,298,762	1,298,905
PRIVATE	430,293	430,298	438,905	438,910

Table 13

Verification of Weights by Type and Quality

	1966		1967		1968		1969	
	Estimated	Actual	Estimated	Actual	Estimated	Actual	Estimated	Actual
UNIVERSITY:								
Hi Qual	61,051	61,051	62,154	62,154	63,839	63,839	66,137	66,137
Med Qual	149,104	149,104	141,191	141,191	145,626	145,626	160,875	160,875
Low Qual	197,645	197,645	182,544	182,544	208,815	208,815	215,964	215,964
4 YEAR COLLEGES:								
Hi Qual	47,265	47,265	50,065	50,065	54,031	54,031	54,632	54,632
Med Qual	149,027	149,027	153,919	153,919	163,285	163,285	171,295	171,295
Low Qual	393,420	393,424	379,220	379,219	394,808	394,809	407,140	407,142
JUNIOR COLLEGES:								
All Qual	538,240	538,240	585,124	585,126	681,039	681,041	661,630	661,630

Table 14

Verification of Weighting Cells

ACE 1966 Cell		ENROLLMENT	Public 1966 Estimated	Public 1966 Actual	%Est./Act.	Private 1966 Estimated	Private 1966 Actual	%Est./Act.	Public 1967 Estimated	Public 1967 Actual	%Est./Act.	Private 1967 Estimated	Private 1967 Actual	%Est./Act.
Pub. 2 Yr. Coll.	1	Low	225,985	225,985	100%				252,447	252,447	100%			
	2	.												
	3	.												
	4	.	248,521	248,521	100				269,206	269,206	100			
	5	High												
Priv. 2 Yr. Coll.	6	Low				63,734	63,734	100%				63,473	63,473	100%
	7	.												
	8	.												
	9	High												
		AFFLUENCE												
	10	Unknown												
	11	Low	16,509	22,247	74	6,808	6,233	109	15,547	20,863	75	7,231	6,322	114
	12	.				4,436	3,307	134				3,838	2,893	133
	13	.	34,850	29,515	117	26,263	21,500	122	27,265	23,660	115	24,790	20,583	120
Universities	14	.	41,595	35,502	117	17,978	16,205	111	42,112	36,544	115	16,192	13,975	116
	15	.	15,221	12,991	117	13,186	15,391	86	14,321	12,428	115	13,624	15,106	90
	16	.	98,394	86,379	114				90,660	76,785	118			
	17	.	45,947	43,904	105	4,792	3,572	134	45,072	44,213	102	4,463	3,364	133
	18	.	62,464	84,173	74	19,624	26,964	73	59,923	80,407	75	20,849	28,830	72
	19	High												
	20	Unknown	104,855	77,217	136	75,133	62,179	121	107,394	78,731	136	68,763	58,117	118
	21	Low												
	22	.	103,696	106,939	97	47,015	46,003	102	99,375	106,064	94	45,758	44,667	102
4 Yr. Coll.	23	.	39,595	56,425	70	64,125	63,213	101	42,085	57,627	72	62,450	62,396	100
	24	.	47,943	52,263	92	34,023	36,858	92	48,221	51,536	94	33,335	35,140	95
	25	.	7,544	8,540	88	17,639	21,560	82	7,807	8,802	84	17,861	21,153	84
	26	.	11,758	13,960	84	17,899	22,470	80	13,177	15,299	86	16,560	20,264	82
	27	.				3,902	4,353	90				3,902	4,369	89
	28	.				8,000	8,733	92				9,204	9,852	93
	29	High				6,580	8,870	74				7,310	9,102	80
	TOTAL		1,104,607	1,104,611	100%	431,137	431,145	100 %	1,134,612	1,134612	100%	419,603	419,606	100%

Table 14(cont'd.)

ACE 1966 Cell		ENROLL-MENT	Public 1968 Estimated	Public 1968 Actual	%Est. Act.	Private 1968 Estimated	Private 1968 Actual	%Est. Act.	Public 1969 Estimated	Public 1969 Actual	%Est. Act.	Private 1969 Estimated	Private 1969 Actual	%Est. Act.
Pub.	1	Low	313,096	313,096	100%				337,239	337,239	100%			
2 Yr.	2	.												
Coll.	3	.												
	4	.	301,434	301,434	100				264,094	264,094	100			
	5	High												
Priv.	6	Low				66,511	66,511	100				60,297	60,297	100%
2 Yr.	7	.												
Coll	8	.												
	9	High												
		AFFLUENCE												
	10	Unknown												
	11	Low	20,639	26,801	77	4,857	4,379	111	17,447	22,825	76	9,261	6,653	139
	12	.				3,617	2,777	130				3,839	2,758	139
	13	.	32,112	28,330	113	26,561	22,193	120	32,021	27,825	115	31,514	22,690	139
	14	.	48,290	42,603	113	18,099	15,641	116	58,874	51,160	115	11,596	15,545	75
	15	.	14,480	12,775	113	15,081	16,564	91				14,972	19,725	76
	16	.	89,244	75,512	118				103,110	91,036	113			
	17	.	49,241	47,607	103	4,536	3,482	130	55,627	51,915	107			
	18	.	68,253	88,632	77	23,267	31,062	75	72,407	94,724	76	32,307	36,239	89
	19	High												
	20	Unknown	120,116	85,407	141	72,047	59,311	121	66,461	206,260	32	73,097	56,367	130
	21	Low												
	22	.	98,279	113,104	87	46,630	46,145	101				45,294	45,839	99
	23	.	43,429	59,888	73	60,123	60,705	99	72,040	60,046	120	62,788	63,031	100
	24	.	57,089	58,108	98	34,456	36,417	95	180,997	62,724	289	35,736	37,422	95
	25	.	10,750	11,203	96	17,722	21,343	83	28,426	11,484	248	18,154	22,892	79
	26	.	14,698	16,648	88	16,996	21,000	81	9,842	17,433	56	18,740	29,211	77
	27	.				3,830	4,320	89				3,616	4,468	81
	28	.				8,452	9,039	94				10,050	10,819	93
	29	High				7,511	9,409	80				7,646	10,004	70
	TOTAL		1,281,146	1,281,148	100%	430,296	430,298	100%	1,298,762	1,298,765	100%	438,409	438,410	100%

There is considerable variation in the size of the weights from a low of about 2 to a high around 2,000. While this much variation is technically satisfactory, care must be taken in analysis so that misleading results are not obtained from the analysis of a few students with very high weights. It should be noted that the weights do not totally eliminate the bias introduced by non-random institutional selection on the non-response bias. (A discussion of undergraduate non-response bias appears on pp.).

Nonresponse Bias

A random sample of graduate students and faculty was drawn for intensive follow-up. Two thousand faculty members and 2,037 graduate students were selected from the original samples. At the time the samples were drawn, over 50% of these special samples had returned the appropriate questionnaire. Approximately 1,000 graduate students and 800 faculty members were thus left to follow-up. The intention was to compare these special samples, both with a high rate of response,with the respective full samples to determine the extent of the bias, if any, that results from response rates of 64% for the graduate students and 60% for the faculty. Six items were chosen for the follow-up sample, items thought to represent possible bias.[15] These will be examined in some detail below.

Faculty

Of those drawn in the special faculty sample, 1512 respondents completed the faculty questionniare, 214 answered the brief list of questions asked in the telephone interview providing information comparable to that

---

15. The six items asked in the telephone interview were: Rank, Kind of appointment (tenure), Highest degree, Date of birth, Research or Teaching as primary interest and Political identification.

on the questionnaire, 128 faculty members refused to answer any questions; 87 could not be located; 59 individuals were not contacted because of assurances that the questionnaire had been returned, although in fact they were not.

We have, then, a response rate in this special sample of 76% to the whole questionnaire and of 86% to the six items asked both in the questionnaire and in the telephone interview. This is a conservative estimate of response rate in this special sample, since it is likely that at least some of the 87 who could not be located had in fact left academic life, and were therfore no longer part of the population which we were sampling.

By comparing the 2,000 sample, the sample which best represents the population, with the total sample we can discover the differences, if any, between a sample with a return rate of 60% and a sample with a return rate of 86%. In the following discussion we will, for the most part, be comparing distributions of characteristics in a sample of the "achieved" sample with distributions in the special or "criterion" sample of 2,000.[16] Several weighted distributions on the entire "achieved" sample are presented below for comparison with a sample of the achieved sample and the criterion sample. Because of the expense of using the entire "achieved" sample most of the distributions are presented for a random sample of 8,500 drawn from the total sample of 60,000.

The most complete respondent information is available for sex and

---

16. The "criterion" sample includes 1197 people who responded before the phone survey, 542 who responded after being phoned and 214 who answered only the telephone interview. The "telephone" sample includes only the latter two categories, i.e., only the respondents in the nonrespondent sample. Except where otherwise indicated, tables are presented with the not answered category excluded.

quality of institution. For both variables we have information from independent sources. As we can see in Table 15A, the criterion sample does not differ on sex from the achieved sample; Table 15B indicates that while medium quality universities are very slightly overrepresented and faculty in junior colleges slightly underrepresented the achieved sample is remarkably close to the criterion sample.

Table 15A

Distribution of Sex in the Achieved and Criterion Samples (Faculty)[17a]

SEX	Total Achieved Sample	Achieved Sample	Criterion Sample
Male	80.0	80.0	79.9
Female	20.0	20.0	20.1
	100.0	100.0	100.0
Unweighted N	58884	8500	1901
All Other	1183	0	99
Unweighted Total	60,028	8500	2000
Weighted Total	(446,203)	(61,117)[17b]	*

17a. All tables are presented in weighted form; for an explanation of the weighting scheme used, refer to page 29. The weights for the criterion samples are constructed from the institutional base weight excluding institutional non-response and correcting for quality and type of control.

17b. The weighted total presented here is approximately a seventh of the projected population total of 466,203. This is a function of using a sample that is approximately a seventh of the obtained N of 60,028 for the faculty.

Table 15B

Distribution of Quality in the Achieved and Criterion Samples (Faculty)

QUALITY	Total Achieved Sample	Achieved Sample	Criterion Sample
Universities			
High Quality	12.6	12.5	11.4
Medium Quality	18.1	18.1	15.6
Low Quality	15.8	15.7	15.5
Colleges			
High Quality	5.7	5.6	6.0
Medium Quality	10.9	10.9	11.7
Low Quality	22.4	22.3	23.6
Junior Colleges	14.6	14.6	16.2
	100.1	99.7	100.0
Unweighted N	60,028	8500	2000
All Other	0	0	0
Unweighted Total	60,028	8500	2000
Weighted Total	(446,203)	(61,117)	*

Table 16

Distributions of Selected Characteristics in the Achieved Sample and the Criterion Sample (Faculty)

RANK	Total Achieved Sample	Achieved Sample	Criterion Sample
Professor	22.8	23.5	22.0
Associate Professor	21.0	20.7	18.6
Assistant Professor	27.6	27.8	27.3
Instructor	19.2	18.3	19.7
Lecturer	2.9	2.8	3.2
No rank designated	3.9	4.3	5.9
Other	2.5	2.5	3.3
	99.9	99.9	100.0
Unweighted N	59836	8478	1718
All Other	192	22	282
Unweighted Total	60,028	8500	2000
Weighted Total	(446,203)	(61,177)	*

Table 16 (cont'd)

KIND OF APPOINTMENT	Achieved Sample	Criterion Sample
Regular with tenure	50.7	48.7
Regular without tenure	44.3	45.2
Acting	2.0	2.0
Visiting	2.6	4.5
	100.1	100.4
Unweighted N	8429	1694
All Other	71	306
Unweighted Total	8500	2000
Weighted Total	(61,177)	*

FIELD OF HIGHEST DEGREE		
Business, Commerce and Management	4.0	5.6
Biological Sciences	7.3	6.7
Education	15.0	14.2
Engineering	5.8	5.4
Fine Arts	8.3	8.9
Old Professions--Medicine and Law	4.3	4.7
Humanities	21.7	20.7
Phys. Sci.--Math and Statistics	13.4	12.5
Psychology and Social Sci.	12.5	12.2
New and Semi-Professions	7.7	8.9
	100.0	99.8
Unweighted N	7418	1462
All Other	1082	538
Unweighted Total	8500	2000
Weighted Total	(61,177)	*

Table 16 (cont'd)

HIGHEST DEGREE	Achieved Sample	Criterion Sample
Ph.D.	41.5	37.2
First Professional--Medical Degree (eg., M.D., D.D.S.)	4.1	4.5
First Professional--Law Degree	1.2	1.8
Ed.D.	4.5	3.0
Other Doctorate	1.4	1.5
Doctorate of Arts or Equiv.	1.9	2.3
Other First Professional--Beyond Undergrad Bachelors	7.7	6.6
Master's	32.1	35.6
Undergraduate Bachelor's	4.8	6.0
Less than Bachelor's	.6	.8
None	.2	.7
	100.0	100.0
Unweighted N	8106	1656
All Other	394	344
Unweighted Total	8500	2000
Weighted Total	(61,177)	*

DATE OF BIRTH		
1908 or before	7.1	8.1
1909-1913	6.4	7.2
1914-1918	9.0	9.8
1919-1923	13.0	12.8
1924-1928	14.9	16.3
1929-1933	16.9	15.0
1934-1938	17.3	16.1
1939-1943	12.6	13.3
1944 or later	2.7	1.4
	99.9	100.0
Unweighted N	8353	1692
All Other	147	308
Unweighted Total	8500	2000
Weighted Total	(61,177)	*

Table 17

Faculty--Interests Primarily in Research or Teaching

	Achieved Sample	Criterion Sample
Very Heavily in Research	4.1	3.6
In both--but Leaning Toward Research	20.4	19.6
In both--but Leaning Toward Teaching	33.7	30.5
Very Heavily in Teaching	41.4	46.2
	99.6	99.9
Unweighted N	8231	1621
All Other	269	379
Unweighted Total	8500	2000
Weighted Total	(61,117)	*

Table 18

Faculty--% with Interests Heavily in Teaching by Quality of Institution

	Achieved Sample	Criterion Sample
Universities		
High Quality	15.5	22.6
Medium Quality	22.2	23.8
Low Quality	31.7	38.2
Colleges		
High Quality	32.5	36.9
Medium Quality	45.4	55.8
Low Quality	53.5	54.3
Junior Colleges	73.9	75.1
Unweighted N	(2517)	(554)

Table 19

Political Self-Identification (Faculty)

	Achieved Sample	Criterion Sample
Left	4.8	5.2
Liberal	39.0	39.5
Middle-of-the-Road	26.3	25.7
Moderately Conservative	24.4	20.8
Strongly Conservative	2.5	3.6
Refused (Telephone Questionnaire Only) Not Answered	3.1	5.6
	100.1	99.4
Unweighted N	8299	1704
All Other	201	296
Unweighted Total	8500	2000
Weighted Total	(61,177)	*

Distributions in Table 16 indicate that there are no major differences between the achieved sample and the criterion sample on rank, appointment and field of highest degree. The only real difference appears in the distribution of advanced degrees. The achieved sample slightly overrepresents faculty members with Ph.D.'s and underrepresents faculty members with Master's and Doctor of Arts degrees. It does not appear, however, that the criterion sample includes more younger men working toward advanced degrees. It is more likely that this is a function of the slight underrepresentation of Junior College faculty in the achieved sample.

One further difference emerges in the item on research and teaching interests. Table 17 indicates a 5% difference between the achieved and criterion sample in the number of respondents whose primary interest is "very heavily in teaching." It appears that the achieved

sample somewhat overrepresents individuals interested in research or research and teaching. Interestingly this difference appears also in universities and is not a function only of the lack of a research choice in colleges and junior colleges (Table 18).

There are reasons to expect the nonresponse rate among the left to be somewhat high. Research focused specifically on activists on the left is frequently condemned in radical literature; research itself is often the target for much debate and sometimes demonstration. Table 19 indicates that there is little difference between the achieved sample and the criterion sample. The "not answered" category for both samples is slightly larger than in many attitudinal questions in the achieved sample. The number is too small to analyze in detail but some preliminary tables indicate that respondents who refused to answer or who did not answer do not cluster in any particular age, department, or rank categories.

The similarity of the two samples holds up equally well if we turn from marginal to bi-variate tabulations. Although there are some differences in particular cells the distributions are quite similar. Table 20A and 20B compare rank within categories of quality for the achieved and the criterion sample. Tables 21A and 21B compare age for both samples. The minor discrepencies in the joint distributions may be real deviations (e.g., the differences between the proportion holding the rank of professor in the achieved (34%) and the criterion (30%)) or they may be a function of the small N's in the criterion sample. The fit is close enough in both distributions to give us the same picture.

There is no apparent difference between the two samples, indicating that the respondents to the faculty survey are not significantly different

from the non-respondents and that the 60% (achieved) sample adequately represents the total population.

TABLE 20A

Rank by Quality of Institution
Faculty-Achieved Sample

	Quality							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Total
Professor	33.9	30.0	24.5	28.0	20.8	23.2	6.5	23.5
Assoc. Prof.	19.7	24.7	25.4	23.9	22.3	20.6	8.3	20.7
Asst. Prof.	25.3	31.0	30.0	32.0	31.8	27.6	18.8	27.8
Instructor	8.7	9.0	16.4	10.4	19.8	24.5	33.2	18.3
Lecturer	6.6	3.5	1.7	2.4	2.4	1.8	1.9	2.8
No Rank	.5	.3	.2	.3	1.1	.9	26.9	4.3
Other	5.3	1.5	1.8	2.9	1.8	1.5	4.4	2.5
	100.0	100.0	100.0	99.9	100.0	100.1	100.0	
Unweighted N	1901	2175	2109	646	724	630	293	8478
Unweighted All Other	4	6	5	1	4	2	0	22
Total	1905	2181	2114	647	728	632	293	8500
Weighted N	7614	11379	10492	3590	7536	13444	9031	63087

TABLE 20B

Rank by Quality of Institution
Faculty-Criterion Sample

	Quality							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Total
Professor	29.7	33.4	25.1	24.4	16.7	20.3	4.8	26.6
Assoc. Prof.	21.0	22.9	20.7	18.9	21.4	20.3	11.3	20.9
Asst. Prof.	26.3	25.6	33.7	29.9	37.3	32.8	4.8	28.7
Instructor	10.1	12.6	16.9	15.0	19.8	16.4	41.9	15.1
Lecturer	7.2	2.7	1.4	6.3	1.6	5.5	0.0	3.8
No Rank	1.0	.4	.2	1.6	1.6	1.6	29.0	1.8
Other	4.6	2.5	1.9	3.9	1.6	3.1	8.1	3.1
	99.9	100.1	99.9	100.0	100.0	100.0	99.9	100.0
Unweighted N	414	446	415	127	126	128	62	1718
Unweighted All Other	99	74	51	18	16	14	10	282
Total	513	520	466	145	142	142	72	2000

TABLE 21A

Date of Birth by Quality of Institution
Faculty-Achieved Sample

	Quality							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Total
-1908	7.1	7.7	7.4	6.1	5.6	9.0	4.8	7.1
1909-13	7.7	5.8	6.2	6.0	7.6	6.8	5.2	6.4
1914-18	8.9	9.3	8.0	10.8	7.6	10.4	8.5	9.0
1919-23	11.2	13.1	12.2	10.0	11.2	14.2	16.2	13.0
1924-28	15.2	16.1	15.9	15.2	13.0	13.3	15.6	14.9
1929-33	17.9	16.6	18.3	19.6	18.0	16.0	14.5	16.9
1934-38	19.3	18.1	16.1	16.9	18.8	15.8	17.3	17.3
1939-43	10.1	12.6	13.7	14.3	15.0	10.2	14.3	12.6
1944-	2.6	.8	2.1	1.0	3.1	4.5	3.6	2.7
	100.0	100.1	99.9	99.9	100.0	100.2	100.0	99.9
Unweighted N	1876	2142	2076	632	719	622	286	8353
Unweighted All Other	29	39	38	15	9	10	7	147
Total	1905	2181	2114	647	728	632	293	8500
Weighted N	7614	11379	10492	3590	7536	13444	9031	63087

TABLE 21B

Date of Birth by Quality of Institution
Faculty-Criterion Sample

	Quality							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Total
-1908	7.6	8.3	6.7	6.3	7.1	8.2	10.0	7.6
1909-13	5.6	9.0	7.2	4.8	6.3	13.1	13.3	8.5
1914-18	8.1	8.8	6.4	9.5	7.9	13.1	13.3	8.5
1919-23	12.7	12.8	14.6	11.1	13.4	9.0	18.3	13.1
1924-28	14.2	15.8	14.6	19.0	18.9	13.9	20.0	15.6
1929-33	18.9	15.3	16.0	7.9	13.4	14.8	11.7	15.5
1934-38	17.9	17.6	18.5	19.0	18.9	10.7	11.7	17.4
1939-43	11.8	11.7	14.6	20.6	14.2	16.4	10.0	13.5
1944-	3.2	.7	1.5	1.6	0.0	.8	1.7	1.5
	100.0	100.0	100.1	99.8	100.1	100.0	100.0	100.0
Unweighted N	408	444	405	126	127	122	60	1692
Unweighted All Other	105	76	61	19	15	20	12	308
Total	513	520	466	145	142	142	72	2000
Weighted N	808	1111	1099	426	834	1676	1152	7108

Graduates

Of the 2037 graduate students drawn in the special sample, 1580 respondents completed the questionnaire, 190 answered the brief list of questions asked in the telephone interview, 128 graduate students refused to answer any questions and 139 were unlocatable.

For the graduate special or criterion sample we have a response rate of 78% to the whole questionnaire and of 87% to the six items[18] asked both in the questionnaire and the telephone interview. This is,

18. The six items asked in the telephone interview were: year entered graduate school, highest degree working for, department, when degree expected, political identification and employment. Information was obtained on institutional quality and the respondent's sex from independent sources.

again, a conservative estimate since some of the 139 students who could not be located had undoubtedly left academic life.

By comparing the distributions of characteristics of the achieved and criterion[19] samples we can determine whether the achieved sample, with a response rate of 64%, is in fact representative of the population from which it is drawn.

The most complete respondent information is available for quality of the respondent's institution and sex. Tables 22A and 22B give the distributions for both samples. The distributions for both variables in the two samples are quite close. Table 22A indicates that the achieved graduate sample somewhat underrepresents medium quality universities and overrepresents low quality colleges. Few graduate students are located in low quality colleges. The largest number of graduate students are located in medium quality universities, thus there is no serious bias in underrepresenting this category given, as we shall see below, that the criterion and the achieved samples appear quite similar on all other variables.

---

19. Several weighted distributions on the entire "achieved" sample are presented below. Because of the cost involved in using full samples the remaining distributions are presented for a sample of 8500 of the achieved sample. These are compared with the criterion sample. The criterion sample includes all 2,037 of the graduate students chosen for the special sample.

22A

Distribution of Quality in the Achieved and Criterion Samples (Graduate)[20a]

QUALITY OF INSTITUTION	Total Achieved Sample	Achieved Sample	Criterion Sample
Universities			
High Quality	17.1	16.6	16.9
Medium Quality	25.7	24.8	29.6
Low Quality	22.1	22.2	23.5
Colleges			
High Quality	6.0	6.0	5.3
Medium Quality	12.0	11.7	10.7
Low Quality	17.1	18.6	13.9
	100.0	99.9	99.9
Unweighted N	32,964	8500	2000
All Other	0	0	0
Unweighted Total	32,964	8500	2000
Weighted Total	(1,005,834)	(264,017)[20b]	*

Table 22B

Distribution of Sex in the Achieved and Criterion Samples (Graduate)

SEX			
Male	68.8	71.2	69.3
Female	31.2	28.8	30.5
	100.0	100.0	100.0
Unweighted N	32818	8462	2030
All Other	145	38	7
Unweighted Total	32,964	8500	2037
Weighted Total	(1,005,834)	(264,017)	*

20a. All tables are presented in weighted form; for an explanation of the weighting scheme used, refer to page 29. The weights for the criterion sample are constructed from the institutional base weight excluding institutional non-response and correcting for quality and control.

20b. The weighted total presented here is approximately a quarter of the projected population total of 1,005,834.

The distributions of "year entered graduate school," "highest degree working for," "When degree expected" and "department" are given in Table 23A-D. There appear to be some minor differences between the two samples. Fifty-one percent of the achieved sample entered graduate school between 1967 and 1969; 48% of the criterion sample entered in these years. Fifty-five percent of the achieved sample are working for Master's degrees as opposed to 51% in the criterion sample. Thirty-nine percent of the graduate students in the achieved sample expect their degree "this" (1969) year; 34% of those in the criterion sample expect their degree "this" year. The achieved sample, then, slightly undersamples long-term Ph.D. students. There do not appear to be any differences by field (Table 23D).

Graduate students were also asked about their employment status. Table 24 indicates that there are only minor differences between the two samples on this variable. As with the faculty samples we anticipated the possibility of bias on political characterization. Again, the two distributions are virtually identical (Table 25). The distributions are also quite similar when quality is introduced (Table 26). There are minor differences in particular cells but the relationship in both samples is the same. For both the criterion and the achieved samples the proportion of left and liberal graduate students decreases as the quality of the institution decreases. The one significant difference appears in the number of left graduate students in high quality colleges. The discripency between the two samples is, no doubt, a function of the small N in the criterion sample. (The unweighted N for this cell is 6.)

Table 23A

Distributions of Selected Characteristics in the Achieved Sample and the Criterion Sample (Graduate)

In what year did you first enter graduate school?

	Achieved Sample		Criterion Sample	
1955 or before	3.4		5.2	
1956-7	1.7		2.6	
1958-9	2.3		2.6	
1960-1	3.7		4.8	
1962-3	7.9		7.7	
1964	7.6		6.0	
1965	9.4		9.8	
1966	13.1		13.4	
1967	22.4	50.9	17.5	47.5
1968-9	28.5		30.0	
	100.0		99.6	
Unweighted N	8188		1692	
All Other	312		345	
Unweighted Total	8500		2037	
Weighted Total	(264,017)			

Table 23B

Highest degree working for

	Achieved Sample		Criterion Sample	
Ph.D.	22.6		24.7	
First Professional Medical	4.7		5.0	
First Professional Law	5.3		5.0	
Ed.D.	2.2		2.0	
Other Doctorate	.5		.3	
Doctorate of Arts	.9		1.1	
Other First Professional	6.1		5.8	
M.A.T.	3.8	54.7	1.8	50.6
M.A.	50.9		48.8	
B.A.	--		.7	
Less than B.A.	--		--	
None	3.1		4.7	
	100.1		99.9	
Unweighted N	7785		1609	
All Other	715		428	
Unweighted Total	8500		2037	
Weighted Total	(264,017)			

Table 23C

When do you expect to get the degree you are now working for?

	Achieved Sample		Criterion Sample	
This year	39.1	74.5	33.6	68.2
Within 2 years	35.4		34.6	
Within 3 years	12.5		13.6	
Within 4 years	5.2		5.5	
Within 5 years	3.5		4.3	
6 or more years	1.7		2.9	
Don't expect to get	2.6		5.4	
	100.0		99.9	
Unweighted N	8136		1676	
All Other	364		361	
Unweighted Total	8500		2037	
Weighted Total	(264,017)			

Table 23D

Department in which you are studying

	Achieved Sample	Criterion Sample
Business, Commerce, Management	8.8	8.5
Biological Sciences	4.9	4.5
Education	22.3	22.7
Engineering	9.8	9.5
Fine Arts	3.6	3.2
Medicine and Law	8.2	8.4
Humanities	12.5	12.4
Physical Sciences, Math, Statistics	11.1	9.6
Social Sciences, Psychology	9.0	9.6
New and Semi-Professions	10.0	12.0
	100.2	100.4
Unweighted N	7965	1642
All Other	535	385
Unweighted Total	8500	2037
Weighted Total	(264,017)	

Table 24

Employment Status in the Achieved and Criterion Samples (Graduate)

Are you now employed for a term or more while a graduate student as:

	Achieved Sample		Criterion Sample
Part-time R.A.	8.3	11.6	10.9 *
Full-time research	3.3		
Part-time T.A.	11.3	15.4	13.7
Full-time teaching	4.1		
Faculty position	4.9		5.2
Other academic	8.4		7.2
None of these	59.8		62.9
	100.1		99.9
Unweighted N	6977		1451
All Other	1523		586
Unweighted Total	8500		2037
Weighted Total	(264,017)		

*The telephone respondents were not asked whether the position held was part- or full-time.

Table 25

Political Self-Identification (Graduate)

Left	5.8	5.8
Liberal	37.2	37.7
Middle-of-the-Road	27.7	27.1
Moderately Conservative	25.5	25.8
Strongly Conservative	3.9	3.7
	100.1	100.1
Unweighted N	8350	1707
All Other	150	330
Unweighted Total	8500	2037
Weighted Total	(264,017)	

Table 26A

Political Identification by Quality of Institution
(Achieved Sample)

POLITICS	QUALITY						
	Universities			Colleges			
	High	Medium	Low	High	Medium	Low	Total
Left	12.1	6.1	4.1	7.5	1.1	4.3	5.8
Liberal	48.4	40.7	35.3	35.0	33.1	28.1	37.2
Middle-of-the-Road	21.7	27.0	27.9	28.2	32.3	30.6	27.7
Moderately Conservative	16.4	23.3	28.6	28.5	27.8	30.3	25.5
Strongly Conservative	1.5	2.9	4.2	.8	5.7	6.7	3.9
	100.1	100.0	100.1	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.1
Unweighted N	2529	2786	2162	412	282	178	8349
All Other	42	46	42	11	7	3	151
Unweighted Total	2571	2832	2204	423	289	181	8500
Weighted Total	43,944	65,522	58,712	15,972	30,774	49,064	264,017

Table 26B

Political Identification by Quality of Institution
(Criterion Sample)

	QUALITY						
	Universities			Colleges			
POLITICS	High	Medium	Low	High	Medium	Low	Total
Left	15.1	6.3	5.0	2.3	1.0	0.0	8.2
Liberal	45.7	41.3	34.6	39.7	37.7	24.4	39.5
Middle-of-the-Road	22.3	25.8	27.4	35.1	31.3	28.6	25.8
Moderately Conservative	15.4	23.6	29.1	20.6	23.5	42.1	23.4
Strongly Conservative	1.7	3.2	3.9	2.3	6.4	4.9	3.0
	100.2	100.2	100.0	100.0	99.9	100.0	99.9
Unweighted N	510	593	441	91	54	42	1731
All Other	91	100	78	14	11	12	306
Unweighted Total	601	693	519	105	65	54	2037

Table 27A

Age by Quality of Institution

(Achieved Sample)

	QUALITY						
	Universities			Colleges			
AGE	High	Medium	Low	High	Medium	Low	Total
21 or younger	2.4	1.3	.6	2.8	.2	0.0	1.0
22	11.7	8.7	7.4	9.0	5.6	1.6	7.3
23	13.1	11.1	9.8	12.3	10.8	5.2	10.1
24	12.7	11.1	9.6	9.4	11.3	5.4	9.9
25	12.2	11.1	8.9	8.7	6.7	8.0	9.5
26-27	16.1	17.0	15.7	15.7	14.3	10.2	14.9
28-29	10.0	9.7	11.4	6.5	9.6	9.9	10.0
30-34	10.0	13.4	17.0	20.3	13.8	26.1	16.5
35-39	5.7	7.6	8.0	5.6	9.3	9.5	7.8
40 or older	6.2	9.0	11.8	9.7	18.4	24.1	13.1
	100.1	100.0	100.2	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.1
Unweighted N	2554	2806	2184	418	286	181	8429
All Other	17	26	20	5	3	0	71
Unweighted Total	2571	2836	2204	423	289	181	8500
Weighted Total	43,944	65,552	58,712	15,972	30,774	49,064	264,017

Table 27B

Age by Quality of Institution

(Criterion Sample)

	QUALITY						
	Universities			Colleges			
AGE	High	Medium	Low	High	Medium	Low	Total
21 or younger	1.9	1.1	.4	.8	1.2	0.0	.9
22	10.4	8.0	7.1	7.2	19.4	6.0	9.1
23	13.1	11.3	8.3	7.5	4.2	2.0	8.7
24	12.2	11.2	10.2	18.9	6.2	1.8	9.8
25	10.3	11.8	9.5	7.2	9.5	8.3	10.0
26-27	17.6	15.8	16.6	11.3	5.0	7.6	13.8
28-29	9.1	10.7	12.3	13.2	9.5	12.6	11.1
30-34	13.4	12.8	15.6	7.2	12.3	19.2	13.8
35-39	6.7	7.3	7.7	10.6	8.5	13.1	8.6
40 or older	5.3	10.0	12.4	16.2	24.2	29.6	14.2
	100.0	100.0	100.1	100.1	100.0	100.2	100.0
Unweighted N	516	598	445	91	57	40	1747
All Other	85	95	74	14	8	14	290
Unweighted Total	601	693	519	105	65	54	2037

The joint distributions of age and quality of institution are given in Table 27. There are, again, minor differences, due probably to the small N in the criterion sample. Overall, the distributions tell the same study. In general, we see that the age distributions are quite similar regardless of quality but that older students are slightly more likely to be found in lower quality colleges.

For graduate students as well as faculty we are confident that, with the minor exceptions indicated, the achieved samples represent the population from which they are drawn. We can also say that the non-respondents are not different from the respondents in ways significant to cause any substantial differences between the criterion and achieved samples.

Undergraduates

A total of 70,694 questionnaires were returned in usable form out of 171,520 mailed on December 20, 1969. This represents a response rate of 41.2%. The only addresses available were parents' addresses which, in many instances, were out of date. Parents were depended on to forward questionnaires to students who were not home for the Christmas break. No attempts were made to follow-up non-respondents.

A random sample of 10% of the entire sample of undergraduates to whom questionnaires were mailed was drawn for the non-response analysis. Our purpose, here, is to compare this criterion sample (which includes respondents and non-respondents) with a sample of 20,000 respondents to see what differences, if any, exist between the two samples due to the low rate of response.

Because the entire sample responded in their freshmen year to an ACE questionnaire, considerable data are available on all non-respondents. By comparing the 10% criterion sample, the sample which best represents the population, with a random sample of the respondent questionnaires we can determine the differences between the "achieved" sample and what would have been obtained if all sampled individuals had returned the questionnaires.

All tables are presented in weighted form (for an explanation of the weighting scheme used on the undergraduate data, refer to page 39). The weights for the achieved sample are constructed in the same manner as the final respondent weights excluding, of course, the institutional non-response factor. The weights for the criterion sample are constructed from the strata weight, correcting for quality and control. All the variables are presented in the following format: variable (e.g. father's education) for the criterion sample; variable for the respondent or achieved sample (currently and not currently enrolled students); variable for currently enrolled respondents; variable for not currently enrolled respondents.[21] Because of slight differences in the weights for the achieved and criterion samples and rounding error in the computation of the percentages for weighted tables, differences of up to two percentage points should be anticipated between categories of variables in the criterion and in the achieved samples. This poses no analytic problems but does pose a descriptive problem when considering a variable in which a significant category, such as the percentage of black undergraduates, is extremely small to begin with. Users are cautioned, therefore, to consider this when using the data descriptively.

Table 28 shows the number of questionnaires sent out by year of college entrance and the response rate for each cohort. The effect of having older

21. We refer, here, to currently and not currently enrolled entrants as "students" although those who are not currently enrolled are either temporarily or permanently not students.

Table 28

Response Rates by Year Entered College as a Freshman

	Seniors 1966	Juniors 1967	Sophomores 1968	Freshmen 1969	TOTAL
Number of questionnaires sent out	50,158	48,610	40,217	32,535	171,520*
Number undeliverable	3,756	2,545	1,992	1,103	9,396
Number returned	19,190	18,909	17,611	14,984	70,694*
Response rate	38.3	38.9	43.8	46.1	41.2*

*These figures include only those students included in the Carnegie study of undergraduates. ACE augumented the study with some additional students which accounts for any differences in total which may be published by ACE.

addresses and a higher drop out rate for the older cohorts is a lower response rate among seniors than among freshmen.

Most studies of non-response bias have found that non-response is associated with lower social class and its correlates such as non-white race and attendence at poor quality schools. Here we are not solely concerned with the differences between respondents and non-respondents. Instead the focus is on the differences between a sample in which all the non-respondents are included and one in which they are not. In the analysis which follows we shall try to answer the following questions: What are the differences between the achieved sample (with a 40% response rate) and the criterion sample (with a 100% response rate)? To what degree are demographic variables responsible for these differences? And to what degree are variables associated with the academic careers of undergraduate students the cause of differences in response rates among particular sub-sets of the population? For the latter analysis we will look at quality of the institution entered as a freshman, high school grade point average, intended

major and academic aspirations.

In the undergraduate study the largest potential source of bias is due to the low response rate among individuals who are not currently enrolled in college. The undergraduate sample is a sample of entrants to the nearly 200 institutions, over a four year period. The weighted projections are to the universe of entrants in the four year period. 12% of the achieved sample is made up of students who are not currently enrolled in college. Based on population projections and studies of attrition we estimate that 30% to 35% of the criterion sample were no longer enrolled in college at the time the survey was conducted.[22] Using these estimates of attrition, the response rate among currently enrolled students would be approximately 52%, among not currently enrolled it would be approximately 17%.

As we shall see, respondents who are not currently enrolled (NCE) differ considerably from currently enrolled (CE) students. NCE respondents are in lower quality institutions; they are from families with lower socio-economic status; and as entrants they had lower high school grades and lower academic aspirations than CE students. We would anticipate differences, then, between the criterion sample with many NCE non-respondents and the achieved sample with fewer NCE respondents.

Because such a large component of non-response to this study (but by no means the only component) is probably due to enrollment status we can infer certain important characteristics associated with attrition from the analysis of non-response. We can also identify here the kinds of students

---

22. In a study of attrition among undergraduates, Astin and Panos report that "65% of the students in the population (of entrants from 1961) had completed four or more years of college at the time of the study (1965)." In the same study 44% reported that they had changed college or dropped out for some period since entering their first college. See Robert J. Panos and Alexander W. Astin, "Attrition Among College Students," American Educational Research Journal, vol. V, number 1, January 1968.

Table 29

Measure of Socio-Economic Status of Undergraduates

Table 29-A

Father's Educational Attainment

	Criterion Sample	Achieved Sample	C.E. Respondents	N.C.E. Respondents
1-3 years high school or less	25%	22%	22%	28%
High school graduate	29	28	28	29
1-3 years college	19	20	20	21
B.A. or post graduate degree	27	29	30	22
TOTAL	100	99	100	100
WEIGHTED BASE	6,513,516	*	*	*

Table 29-B

Mother's Educational Attainment

	Criterion Sample	Achieved Sample	C.E. Respondents	N.C.E. Respondents
1-3 years high school or less	18%	16%	16%	20%
High school graduate	44	43	43	44
1-3 years college	20	21	21	22
B.A. or post graduate degree	18	19	20	15
TOTAL	100	99	100	101
WEIGHTED BASE	6,513,516	*	*	*

Table 29 [cont.]

Measure of Socio-Economic Status of Undergraduates

Table 29-C

Total Family Income

	Criterion Sample	Achieved Sample	C.E. Respondents		N.C.E. Respondents	
Less than $6,000	16%	15%	14%	29%	19%	36%
$6,000 - $7,999	17	15	15		17	
$8,000 - $9,999	16	17	16		18	
$10,000 - $14,999	26	29	29		27	
$15,000 - $19,999	12	11	12		8	
$20,000 and over	14	14	15		12	
TOTAL	101	101	101		101	
WEIGHTED BASE	6,513,516	*	*		*	

Table 29 [cont.]

Measure of Socio-Economic Status
of Undergraduates

Table 29-D

Race

Criterion Sample			
White	91%		
Non-white	9%	Blacks	49%
	100%	Oriental	8%
		Other (including Native American)	43%
			100%
Achieved Sample			
White	93%		
Non-white	7%	Blacks	44%
	100%	Oriental	6%
		Other (including Native American)	50%
			100%
Currently Enrolled Respondents			
White	93%		
Non-white	7%	Blacks	43%
	100%	Oriental	7%
		Other (including Native American)	50%
			100%
Not Currently Enrolled Respondents			
White	93%		
Non-white	7%	Blacks	50%
	100%	Oriental	10%
		Other (including Native American)	39%
			99%

and institutions from which a low response rate can be expected in similar research.

As has been shown elsewhere, the most substantial impact of socio-economic status on college attendance occurs prior to college entrance. Thus relatively small differences between the criterion and achieved sample were found on most of the demographic variables related to SES, selected for non-response analysis. As Table 29 indicates, there are small differences in parents' educational attainment between the criterion and achieved sample. The same is true for parents' income. There are, as we can see, more substantial differences between the currently and not currently enrolled respondents. 36% of the NCE respondents report total parents' income of less than $7,999; 29% of the currently enrolled report this income. These data suggest that non-respondents and not currently enrolled respondents come from families with somewhat lower socio-economic status than currently enrolled respondents but that these differences are reflected in rather small differences between the criterion and achieved sample.

from families with somewhat lower socio-economic status than currently enrolled respondents but that these differences are reflected in rather small differences between the criterion and achieved sample.

Table 30

Sex

	Criterion Sample	Achieved Sample	C.E. Respondents	N.C.E. Respondents
Male	57	51	52	48
Female	43	49	48	52
TOTAL	100	100	100	100
WEIGHTED BASE	6,513,516	*	*	*

As Table 29-D indicates, non-whites make up a slightly larger proportion of the criterion than the achieved sample. There is, however, no evidence that non-white students are significantly less likely than whites to respond. 9% of the criterion sample is made up of non-white entrants compared to 7% of the achieved sample. Because the percentage of non-white students is quite small it is difficult to determine response rates for the various non-white groups. Table 29-D indicates that half of the not currently enrolled non-white respondents are black compared to 43% of the currently enrolled non-white respondents. This suggests that the achieved sample with a smaller proportion of NCE respondents may underrepresent blacks.

There is little evidence that women leave college more often than men.[23] Therefore, we would expect any difference between the achieved and criterion sample on this variable to be primarily a function of differential response rates among men and women. Table 30 indicates that 57% of the criterion sample are men compared to 51% of the achieved sample. The underrepresentation of men among both CE and NCE suggests that independent of enrollment status men were less likely to respond to the questionnaire. Although there are no baseline statistics for students not currently enrolled, census figures indicate that 60% of currently enrolled undergraduates are men.

Attrition and non-response are both highly correlated with the quality of the institution, preparation for academic life (measured by high school grades), and academic aspirations. 38% of the criterion sample entered junior colleges compared to 28% of the achieved sample. (See Table 31.)

---

23. Astin and Ranos, op. cit., report no significant correlation between sex and attrition.

Table 31

Quality of Entering Institution

	Criterion Sample	Achieved Sample	C.E. Respondents	N.C.E. Respondents
High Quality Universities	4%	5%	6%	2%
Medium Quality Universities	9	10	11	7
Low Quality Universities	12	14	14	12
High Quality Colleges	3	4	4	1
Medium Quality Colleges	10	12	12	8
Low Quality Colleges	24	26	27	23
Junior Colleges	38	28	26	47
TOTAL	100	99	100	100
WEIGHTED BASE	6,513,516	*	*	*

As we can see here nearly half of the not currently enrolled respondents and only 24% of the CE respondents entered junior college as freshmen.

Both achievement in secondary school and level of aspiration affect the decision-making process leading to the choice of a college. Junior college students, overall, have lower grades and lower aspirations. Having less commitment to and preparation for the academic enterprise, they are more likely to leave college. Tables 32-A and 32-B indicate substantial differences between the currently enrolled and not currently enrolled respondents in the proportion entering college with a B+ or better GPA and aspiring to no higher than a BA degree. These large differences are reflected in smaller, but significant, differences between the criterion and achieved sample. These data suggest that marginal students in lower quality institutions are underrespresented in the achieved sample. The data are consistent with our inference that a substantial proportion of our non-respondents and, therefore, of the criterion sample are no longer attending college.

Table 32-A

High School Grade Point Average	Criterion Sample	Achieved Sample	C.E. Respondents	N.C.E. Respondents
B+ or above	28%	38%	39%	22%
B	22	25	25	25
C+, B-	33	27	27	33
C	15	9	8	18
Below C	1	-	-	1
TOTAL	99	99	99	99
WEIGHTED BASE	6,513,516	*	*	*

Table 32-B

Highest Degree Intend to Obtain	Criterion Sample		Achieved Sample		C.E. Respondents		N.C.E. Respondents	
None or AA	13%	49%	8%	43%	6%	41%	20%	58%
BA	36		35		35		38	
MA	33		35		36		26	
Ph.D. or Ed.D.	10		12		13		8	
M.D., D.D.S., D.V.M.	4		6		6		4	
L.L.B. or J.D.	1		-		2		1	
Other	3		2		2		3	
TOTAL	100		98		100		100	
WEIGHTED BASE	6,513,516		*		*		*	

Table 33

Control of Institution: Public/Private

Control	Criterion Sample	Achieved Sample	C.E. Respondents	N.C.E. Respondents
Public	74%	70%	69%	76%
Private	26	30	31	24
TOTAL	100	100	100	100
WEIGHTED BASE	6,513,516	*	*	*

There is a small, but significant, difference between the achieved and criterion sample on institutional control. 74% of the criterion sample entered a public institution compared to 70% of the achieved sample. This is largely a function of the fact the junior colleges in the sample are predominately public institutions and, as noted, a large proportion of the not currently enrolled entered junior colleges.

Table 34

Intended Major Field

	Criterion Sample	Achieved Sample
Agriculture	2%	2%
Biology	3	4
Business	16	11
Education	10	12
Engineering	10	9
English	3	4
Health	4	6
History	6	7
Humanities	4	4
Fine Arts	8	7
Mathematics	3	5
Physical Sciences	2	3
Pre-Professional (L.L.B., M.D., D.V.M.)	7	8
Social Sciences	8	9
Technical	3	2
Non-Technical	3	3
Undeclared	7	6
TOTAL	99	102
WEIGHTED BASE	6,513,516	*

As shown in Table 34, overall there are only small differences in intended major field for the criterion and achieved samples. The achieved sample underrepresents business majors, in particular. This, no doubt, is a function of both the underrepresentation of men and junior college students. Among both groups a significant proportion are men. Correspondingly, the achieved sample slightly overrepresents education majors, a field made up predominantly of women.

It is important, at this point, to keep in mind that differences on related variables (non-random differences) between a criterion and achieved sample only occur in the case where a distinct subset of the population (in this case NCE students or men) is coincident with the subset of non-respondents and where both subsets are large. The largest differences, therefore, occur on variables related to academic performance (a strong predictor of persistence in college and therefore of non-response) and sex (a strong predictor of non-response but not persistence). Thus very small differences between respondents and non-respondents will not be apparent using this method of analysis nor are those differences likely to affect analysis of the data.

An 18% difference between CE and NCE respondents in the proportion of students with a B+ or better GPA is reflected in only a 10% difference between the achieved and criterion sample. This is the largest difference between the two samples among the variables examined here. If the quality of the entering institution is controlled, even these differences are greatly minimized. Referring back to Table 31 we find that only 2% of the NCE respondents entered high quality universities, while 47% entered junior colleges. It is also interesting to note that institutional quality, level of aspiration and preparation for academic life appear to play a

larger role than demographic variables, alone, in determining attrition, and, therefore, non-response.

The final weighting procedures for the achieved sample include a component to compensate for response bias. Because of different inter-cohort response rate, each cohort, within an institution, was weighted separately. Table 35 indicates the final weighted distributions on institutional quality, high school grade point average and sex for the criterion and achieved samples. The final weights underrepresent men and poorly prepared students by less than 5%. On measures of SES (not shown) the differences between the criterion and achieved sample for any given category are less than 2%.

Our conclusion is that, at least on those variables which we have available, the weighted achieved sample of undergraduates represents the population from which it was drawn, with the exceptions noted, and that the magnitude of difference between the two samples is quite small.

Table 35

Final Weighted Distributions

A. Quality of Entering Institution (Criterion and Achieved Samples - Final Weights)

Quality	Criterion Sample	Achieved Sample
High Quality Universities	4%	4%
Medium Quality Universities	9	9
Low Quality Universities	12	12
High Quality Colleges	3	3
Medium Quality Colleges	10	10
Low Quality Colleges	24	24
Junior Colleges	38	38
TOTAL	100	100
WEIGHTED BASE	6,513,516	6,537,869

B. High School Grade Point Average (Criterion and Achieved Samples - Final Weights)

	Criterion Sample	Achieved Sample
B+ or above	28%	33%
B	22	24
C+, B-	33	31
C	15	11
Below C	1	-
TOTAL	99	99
WEIGHTED BASE	6,513,516	6,537,869

Table 35 [cont.]

Final Weighted Distributions

C. Sex (Criterion and Achieved Samples - Final Weights)

	Criterion Sample	Achieved Sample
Male	57%	53%
Female	43	47
TOTAL	100	100
WEIGHTED BASE	6,513,516	6,537,869

Quality Ranking of Institutions

Universities

Institutional quality has proven to be an important control variable. The initial marginals and many later cross tabulations have used institutional quality as a stratifying variable.

The colleges and universities in the sample have been classified on the basis of quality into seven groups: three groups of universities, three groups of four-year colleges, and all junior colleges.

Our university, four-year college, and junior college classification is based on information supplied by the American Council on Education, which information is itself based on the classification scheme developed by the U.S. Office of Education. The Office of Education defines universities as "institutions which give considerable stress to graduate instruction, which confer advanced degrees as well as bachelor's degrees in a variety of liberal arts fields, and which have at least two professional schools that are not exclusively technological." "Four-year colleges" is an "all other" residual category.[24] As some users have noted, this definition is "not very precise," yet it is precise enough to exclude from the university category the California Institute of Technology and other technical institutes one expects to find in studies of graduate education.[25] Although we have been tempted to move some specialized institutions from the four-year college to the university category, systematic reclassification of institutions would require analysis of our data far beyond the scope of this report. For that

---

24. Opening Fall Enrollment in Higher Education: Part A--Summary Data, USGPO, 1969, p. 3.

25. Bernard Berelson, Graduate Education in the United States, McGraw Hill, 1960, pp. 280-281.

matter, since many statistics published by the Office of Education provide reference points for the data presented here, there are obvious advantages to the use of identical definitions, regardless of how unsatisfactory these definitions may be on other grounds.

The basic source of information on quality is The Gourman Report[26] which rates "the undergraduate programs of nearly all of the colleges and universities in the United States." Gourman provides three composite ratings for each institution: a rating of the academic departments in terms of such things as accreditation and the proportion of students receiving scholarships and fellowships; a rating of non-departmental aspects of the institution, such as the administration's "commitment to excellence," the level of financial aid available to students, the board of trustees, and faculty morale (e.g. rank, tenure, salary scale, research facilities); and a total institutional rating, which is simply the arithmetic mean of the departmental and non-departmental ratings. The correlation between the departmental and non-departmental ratings is very high ($r=+.956$).[27] We decided, therefore, to use institutional rating (which correlates+.99 with departmental rating). As Gourman points out, "the criteria for evaluation of the individual departments are quite complex and take into account many factors." Since the department is only one of many elements of the college or university to which Gourman applies a complex rating scheme, since his ranking criteria are at times idiosyncratic (e.g., "one of the basic criteria" for rating method of instruction is the following assertion: "It has

---

26. By Jack Gourman, The Continuing Education Institute, Phoenix, 1967.

27. Walter F. Abbott and Calvin F. Schmid, "Toward An Organizational Theory of Migration: University Prestige and First-Time Undergraduate Student Migration in the United States", unpublished ms., p.19.

been long established that a minimum of ten years after college graduation is necessary to produce an excellent teacher in the college classroom."), and since he does not tell us how he combines the rankings of the various elements to produce over-all scores, our justification for using Gourman's scheme is largely pragmatic.

The Gourman method produces results much like those obtained by other, less ambitious, efforts to rank American institutions of higher education. Of the "top 22 universities" listed by Berelson (Graduate Education in the United States), we have 15 in our sample. All 15 of these institutions are found among the top 22 universities in the sample, when sample institutions are ranked according to Gourman scores. Edward Gross and Paul Grambsch, using information supplied by Allen Cartter,[28] rate major universities in terms of the quality of their doctoral training programs. Although the Gross-Grambsch index ranks graduate schools, and Gourman ranks undergraduate instruction, the correlation between the two ranking systems based on 79 universities, is .83.[29]

Abbott and Schmid provide further validation of the Gourman ratings as they apply to the 79 universities rated by Gross and Grambsch:

---

28. An Assessment of Quality in Graduate Education (Washington, D.C.; American Council on Education, 1966).

29. Gross and Grambsch too have three indexes of quality. The correlation reported is between the Gourman total rating and the Gross-Grambsch index based on a "weighted mean of /Cartter/ departmental ratings." (The simplest of the Gross-Grambsch indexes.) See Abbott and Schmid, p. 19.

Correlations Between Selected Measures of University Quality and Total Gourman Ratings (79 Institutions)

Average compensation of faculty, 1963-64	.78
Number of library volumes	.74
Selectivity	.73
Doctorates conferred, 1861-1962	.71
Percent foreign students	.66

Source: Abbott and Schmid, p. 21.

In short, then, the three categories we use for universities differ little from the gross categories of quality that might be obtained from other well-known quality rankings. Since the Gourman system applies to four-year colleges as well as universities, we have used it here.

The high quality universities score 580 or above on Gourman. In 1968-69 there were 35,118 faculty in these institutions; 13,924 responded to our questionnaire. Of the 114,093 graduate students in these institutions, 10,203 responded to our questionnaire.

The medium quality universities score between 477 and 579 on Gourman. In 1968-69 there were 41,050 faculty in these institutions; 15,475 responded to our questionnaire. Of the 119,486 graduate students, 11,131 responded to the questionnaire.

The low quality universities score less than 477 on Gourman. In 1968-69 there were 30,407 faculty in these institutions; 14,382 responded to our questionnaire. Of the 90,863 graduate students in these universities, 8,230 responded to our questionnaire.

Four-Year Colleges

Grouping of the four-year colleges in our sample is based on a

combination of Gourman rankings and rankings provided by College-Rater,[30] with precedence given to the higher of the ratings available for each college. At first glance, College-Rater appears to base its rankings on a strategy very different from that employed by Gourman. In fact, College-Rater appears to have The Gourman Report in mind when it describes its own procedure:

> COLLEGE-RATER does not attempt to evaluate the academic excellence of a college or university, the competency of its faculty and staff, or the scope and variety of its curricula. Neither does it profess to measure the efficacy of the operation of its various departments nor the size of its physical plant and endowment. Guidelines used do not take into account the quality of the academic program, the intellecutal environment, educational techniques, facilities and other considerations. If such imponderables could be measured, the ratings would change considerably.

In the end, however, Gourman and College-Rater come out with criteria that are much alike and with roughly similar rankings (the correlation between the two sets of scores is+.750). The four major criteria upon which College-Rater scores are based are, in descending order:

SAT/ACT scores of recently enrolled freshman, proportion of faculty with doctorate, faculty salaries, and library collection. As will be recalled from the table presented earlier, three of these variables are strongly correlated with total Gourman scores. (Information on the correlation with the fourth variable, proportion of faculty with doctorate, is not available.)

---

30. College-Rater, Inc., Allentown, Pennsylvania, 1967.

In terms of clarity and logic of method, the College-Rater system is decidedly superior to Gourman's. In terms of outcome, in our judgment, College-Rater does better than Gourman in the ranking of four-year colleges; it does less well in the ranking of universities. (As is to be expected: College-Rater explicitly avoids the subjective judgments that are the basis of most ratings of graduate schools, including our own.)

The top quality colleges score 445 or above on Gourman or 719 and above on College-Rater. In 1968-69 there were 8,820 faculty in these institutions; 4,648 responded to our questionnaire. Of the 20,733 graduate students, 1,640 responded to the questionnaire.

The middle quality colleges score between 378 and 444 on Gourman and between 550 and 718 on College-Rater. In 1968-69 there were 8,396 faculty in these institutions; 4,801 responded to our questionnaire. Of the 14,809 graduate students, 1,062 responded.

The low quality colleges score less than 378 on Gourman and less than 550 on College-Rater. In 1968-69 there were 8,952 faculty in these institutions; 4,801 responded to the questionnaire. Of the 17,056 graduate students, 699 responded to the questionnaire.

All junior colleges were treated as one category. In 1968-69 there were 4,228 faculty in these institutions; 2,140 responded to the questionnaire.

A listing of the universe of universities and colleges, within each of our quality categories, is given on the following pages. Our sample institutions were drawn from this list, but obviously only a portion of the institutions on the list was sampled.

List of American Universities and Colleges by Quality Ranking

QUALITY I INSTITUTIONS

BRANDEIS UNIVERSITY
CARNEGIE-MELLON UNIV
CLEMSON U-ALL CAMPS
CLEMSON UNIV-MAIN CAMPU
CLEMSON UNIV GREENVL BR
CLEMSON UNIV SUMTER BR
COLUMBIA UNIV MAIN DIV
COLUMBIA U TCHRS COL
CORNELL UNIV MAIN CAMPU
CORNELL U MED COL
CORNELL U NURSING
DUKE UNIVERSITY
HARVARD UNIVERSITY
J HPKNS-ADV INST STU
JOHNS HOPKINS U MAIN CA
MASS INST OF TECHNOLOGY
NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY
PRINCETON UNIVERSITY
RICE UNIVERSITY
STANFORD UNIVERSITY
TULANE UNIV OF LOUISIAN
U ILL MED CTR CHICAG
U OF CAL BERKELEY
U OF CAL LOS ANGELES
U OF MINN MNPLS ST PAUL
U OF WIS ALL CAMPS
U OF WIS MADISON
U OF WIS TWO-YR CAMPUSE
U OF WIS U EXTEN
U OF WIS GREEN BAY
U OF WIS PARKSIDE
UNIV OF PENNSYLVANIA
UNIV OF ILL MAIN CAMPUS
UNIV OF NC AT CHAPEL HI
UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTO
UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
UNIVERSITY OF NOTRE DAM
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
UNIVERSITY OF ROCHESTER
V ILL ALL CAM
VANDERBILT UNIVERSITY
YALE UNIVERSITY
YESHIVA UNIV MAIN CAMPU

QUALITY II INSTITUTIONS

AUBURN UNIV ALL CAM
AUBURN UNIV MAIN CAM
AUBURN U MTGOMERY
BOSTON UNIVERSITY
CASE WESTERN RESERVE UN
CATHOLIC UNIV OF AMERIC
CUNY CITY COLLEGE
CUNY FRESHMN PROG GRD C
CUNY - GRADUATE CNTR
CUNY U CTR SEEK PRG
D T WATSN SCH PHYSIA
EMORY UNIV-ALL CAMP
EMORY UNIVERSITY
EMORY UNI-OXFORD COL
GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY
IND U DOWNTWN INDPLS BR
IND UNIV INDIANAPOLIS
IND UNIV KOKOMO
IND UNIV SOUTH BEND
IND UNIV FT WAYNE
IND UNIV NTHWEST CAMPUS
IND UNIV STHESTRN CAMPU
INDIANA UNIV-ALL CMP
INDIANA UNIV-MAIN CAMPU
IOWA ST U OF SCI + TECH
LA ST U MAIN CAMPUS
LA ST U AT ALEXANDRIA
LA ST U MED C N ORLE
LA ST U AT NEW ORLEANS
LA ST U AT EUNICE
LA ST U AT SHREVEPORT
MICH ST UNIV MAIN CAMPU
NEW YORK UNIVERSITY
OHIO ST-WRIGHT FLD B
OHIO ST U MANSFIELD BR
OHIO ST U LIMA BR
OHIO ST U MARION BR
OHIO ST U NEWARK BR
OHIO ST U-ALL CAMPS
OHIO ST UNIV MAIN CAMPU
OHIO UNIV-ALL CAMPS
OHIO UNIV IRONTON BR
OHIO UNIV LANCASTER BR
OHIO UNIV BELMONT CO BR
PA ST U-HERSHY MD CT
PA ST U NEW KENSINGTN C
PA ST U-CAPITOL CAM
PA ST U-KNG PRSA GRD
PENN ST UNIV MAIN CAMPU
PENN ST U BEAVER CAMPUS
PENN ST U DUBOIS CAMPUS
PENN ST U FAYETTE CAMPU
PENN ST U SCRANTON CAMP
PENN ST UNIV ALTOONA CA
PENN ST UNIV HAZLETON C
PENN ST U MCKEESPORT CA
PENN ST U SCHUYLKILL CA
PENN ST U WILKES-BAR CA
PENN ST U BEHREND CAM
PENN ST U BERKS CENTER
PENN ST U MOUNT ALTO
PENN ST U OGONTZ CAM
PENN ST U SHNANGO VLY C
PENN ST U YORK
PENN ST U ALLENTOWN CAM
PENN ST U DELAWARE CAMP
PURDUE UNIV-ALL CAMP
PURDUE UNIV MAIN CAMPUS
PURDUE U INDPLS REG CMP
PURDUE UNIV HAMMOND
PURDUE U MICHIGAN CITY
PURDUE UNIV FT WAYNE
RENSSELAER POLY MAIN CA
RENSSELR POLY I-CONN
RUTGERS THE ST U MAIN C
RUTGERS UNIV DOUGLAS CO
RUTGERS U-UNIV COLL
ST L U PARKS COL AERO T
ST LOUIS U-ALL CAMP
ST LOUIS U MAIN CAMPUS
SUNY ST U BUF MAIN CAMP
SYRACUSE U MAIN CAMPUS
SYRACUSE UNIV UTICA COL
TEXAS A + M UNIVERSITY
TUFTS UNIVERSITY
U CINCINNATI MAIN CAMPU
U CINCINNATI BLUE ASH B
U CIN-TRI CO ACDMC C
U OF CINCINNATI-ALL
U OF CAL DAVIS
U OF C HASTINGS
U OF CAL IRVINE
U OF CAL SAN DIEGO
U OF CAL RIVERSIDE
U OF CAL SAN FRANCISCO
U OF CAL SANTA CRUZ

QUALITY II INSTITUTIONS (Cont'd)

U OF CAL SANTA BARBARA
U OF MD-BALT PROF SC
U OF PTSBRGH BRADFORD C
U OF PTSBRGH GRENSBRG C
U OF PTSBRGH JOHNSTWN C
U OF PTSBRGH TITUSVLE C
U OF VA EASTERN SHORE B
U TEX DENT BR HOUSTN
U TEX MED BR GALVSTN
U TEX MED SCH DALLAS
U TEX NURSING SCH
U TEX SCH PUB HEALTH
U TX GRAD SCH-BIOMED
U TX MD SCH-SN ANTON
UNI OREGON-MED SCH
UNI OREGON-DENT SCH
UNIV COLO MAIN CAMPUS
UNIV COLO MED CTR
UNIV COLO COLO SPRINGS
UNIV COLO DENVER CTR
UNIV MD MAIN CAMPUS
UNIV MD BALTIMORE CO CA
UNIV MISSOURI AT COLUMB
UNIV OKLA MAIN CAMPUS
UNIV OF OK-OKLA CITY
UNIV OREGON-ALL CAMP
UNIV OREGON MAIN CAMPUS
UNIV OF STHRN CALIFORNI
UNIV PITTSBURG-ALL C
UNIV PITTSBRG MAIN CAMP
UNIV TEXAS AT AUSTIN
UNIV VIRGINIA MAIN CAMP
UNIV VA CLINCH VALLEY C
UNIV VA GEO MASON COLLE
UNIV VA PATRICK HENRY B
UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA
UNIVERSITY OF THE PACIF
UNIVERSITY OF DENVER
UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA
UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA
UNIVERSITY OF IOWA
UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS
WASHINGTON STATE UNIV
WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY

QUALITY III INSTITUTIONS

ADELPHI UNIV MAIN CAMPU
ADELPHI U ADEL-SUFFOLK
AMERICAN UNIVERSITY
ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSIT
ATLANTA UNIVERSITY
BAYLOR U-COL DENTIST
BAYLOR U-MEDICAL COL
BAYLOR UNIV MAIN CAMPUS
BOSTON COL MAIN CAMPUS
BOWL GRN ST U-FIRELD
BOWLING GREEN ST U BRYA
BOWLING GRN ST U FREMON
BOWLING GRN ST U MAIN C
BOWLNG GRN ST U FOSTORI
BOWLNG GRN ST U SANDUSK
BRADLEY UNIVERSITY
BRIGHAM YOUNG UNIVERSIT
BUTLER UNIVERSITY
COLORADO STATE UNIVERSI
CREIGHTON UNIVERSITY
DEPAUL UNIVERSITY
DRAKE UNIVERSITY
DUQUESNE UNIVERSITY
FLORIDA A + M UNIVERSIT
FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSIT
FORDHAM UNIVERSITY
GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIV
HOWARD UNIVERSITY
KANSAS ST U AG + APP SC
KENT ST U-ELYRIA
KENT ST U GEAUGA
KENT ST U ORVILLE
KENT ST U SALEM
KENT ST U WADSWORTH
KENT ST U ASHTABULA
KENT ST U CANTON
KENT ST U E LIVERPOOL
KENT ST U TUSCARAWAS
KENT ST U WARREN
KENT ST UNIV MAIN CAMPU
LOYOLA UNIVERSITY
LOYOLA UNIVERSITY
MARQUETTE-SCH MEDIC
MARQUETTE U MAIN CAMPUS
MIAMI U-MIDDLETWN BR
MIAMI U-HAMILTON BR
MIAMI UNI-ALL CAMPS
MIAMI UNIV OXFORD CAMPU
MISSISSIPPI STATE UNIV
MONTANA STATE UNIVERSIT
N C ST U RALEIGH MAIN C
N CAR ST U-FT BRAGG
N MEX ST U-FARMINGTN
NEW MEX ST U UNIV PARK
NEW MEX ST U-CARLSBD
NEW MEX ST U ALAMOGORDO
NORTH DAKOTA STATE UNIV
NORTH TEXAS STATE UNIV
NORTHERN ILLINOIS UNIV
NORTHEASTERN UNIVERSITY
OKLA ST UNIV MAIN CAMPU
OKLA ST UNIV OKMULGEE
OKLA ST UNIV OKLA CITY
OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY
PRATT INSTITUTE
RUTGERS UNIV CAMDEN
RUTGERS UNIV NEWARK
SETON HALL UNIVERSITY
SOUTH DAKOTA STATE UNIV
SOUTHERN METHODIST UNIV
ST JOHNS UNIVERSITY
STHRN ILL CARBONDALE
STHRN ILL EDWARDSVLL
TEMPLE UNIVERSITY
TEXAS CHRISTIAN UNIV
TEXAS TECH UNIV
TEXAS WOMANS UNIVERSITY
U ALAS ANCHORAGE CMTY C
U ALAS JUNEAU DS C C
U ALAS KETCHIKAN C C
U ALAS SITKA C C
U ALAS KENAI PEN C C
U ALAS KODIAK C C
U ALAS MATNU SUS C C
U HAWA HONOLULU CMTY CO
U HAWA KAUAI TECH SCH
U HAWA KAPIOLANI CMTY C
U HAWA MAUI CMTY COL
U HAWA LEEWARD OAHU C
U MINN TECH INST CROOKS
U NEBR-COL MED-OMAHA
U OF MINN DULUTH
U OF MINN MORRIS
U OF WIS MILWAUKEE
U PUERTO RICO RIO PIEDR
U PUERTO RICO MAYAGUEZ
U PUERTO RICO SAN JUAN
U TENN-MARTIN
U TENN-MEMPHIS
U TENN NASHVILLE
UNI MISS MEDICAL CTR

QUALITY III INSTITUTIONS (Cont'd)

UNIV ALABAMA MAIN CAMPU
UNIV ALASKA MAIN CAMPUS
UNIV ARK MAIN CAMPUS
UNIV ARK MED CTR
UNIV CONN ALL CAMPSS
UNIV CONN SOUTHEASTERN
UNIV HAWAII MAIN CAMPUS
UNIV HAWAII HILO
UNIV KY MAIN CAMPUS
UNIV KY CMTY COL SYSTEM
UNIV MAINE MAIN CAMPUS
UNIV MAINE AT PORTLAND
UNIV MASS AMHERST CAMPU
UNIV MASS BOSTON CAMPUS
UNIV MISS-ALL CAMPUS
UNIV MISS MAIN CAMPUS
UNIV MISSOURI AT KANS C
UNIV MISSOURI AT ROLLA
UNIV MISSOURI AT ST LOU
UNIV NEBRASKA MAIN CAMP
UNIV NEVADA MAIN CAMPUS
UNIV N DAK MAIN CAMPUS
UNIV N DAK ELLENDALE CT
UNIV N DAK WILLISTON
UNIV OF UTAH MAIN CAMPU
UNIV OF VT + ST AGRIC C
UNIV OF RHODE ISLAND
UNIV OF ALA HUNTSVILLE
UNIV OF ALA BIRMINGHAM
UNIV OF CONN MAIN CAMPU
UNIV OF CONN HARTFORD
UNIV OF CONN STAMFORD
UNIV OF CONN TORRINGTON
UNIV OF CONN WATERBURY
UNIV OF MAINE-AGUSTA
UNIV OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
UNIV PR HUMACAO REG COL
UNIV PR CAYEY REG COL
UNIV PR ARECIBO REG COL
UNIV R I-ALL CAMPUS
UNIV R I-DIV UNI EX
UNIV S C-ALL CAMPUS
UNIV S C MAIN CAMPUS
UNIV S C BEAUFORT
UNIV S C CONWAY
UNIV S C LANCASTER
UNIV S C FLORENCE
UNIV S C UNION
UNIV S C ALLENDALE
UNIV S C AIKEN
UNIV S C SPARTANBURG
UNIV TENN-KNOXVILLE
UNIVERSITY OF HOUSTON
UNIVERSITY OF WYOMING
UNIVERSITY OF AKRON
UNIVERSITY OF TOLEDO
UNIVERSITY OF TULSA
UNIVERSITY OF PORTLAND
UNIVERSITY SOUTH DAKOTA
UNIVERSITY OF DELAWARE
UNIVERSITY OF MIAMI
UNIVERSITY OF IDAHO
UNIVERSITY OF LOUISVILL
UNIVERSITY OF DETROIT
UNIVERSITY OF MONTANA
UNIVERSITY OF NEW MEXIC
UTAH STATE UNIVERSITY
UTAH ST U - SNOW COL
VA POLY INST MAIN CAMPU
VA POLY INST DANVILLE
VILLANOVA UNIVERSITY
W VA UNIV-ALL CAMPS
W VA U PARKERSBURG
WAKE FOREST UNIVERSITY
WICHITA STATE UNIVERSIT

QUALITY IV INSTITUTIONS

AMHERST COLLEGE
ANTIOCH-PTNY GR S ED
ANTIOCH COLL-ALL CAM
ANTIOCH COL MAIN CAMPUS
AUGUSTANA COLLEGE
BELOIT COLLEGE
BERNARD BARUCH)CUNY*
BOWDOIN COLLEGE
BROWN UNIVERSITY
BRYN MAWR COLLEGE
CALIFORNIA ST COL HAYWA
CALIFORNIA INST OF TECH
CARLETON COLLEGE
CHRSTPHR NWPT COL WM MA
CLAREMONT UNIV CNTR
CLAREMONT MENS COLLEGE
CLARK UNIVERSITY
COL WM + MARY MAIN CAMP
COLGATE UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF WOOSTER
COLORADO COLLEGE
COLORADO SCHOOL OF MINE
COLUMBIA UNIV BARNARD C
CONNECTICUT COLLEGE
COOPER UNION
CUNY BROOKLYN COLLEGE
CUNY HUNTER COLLEGE
CUNY - LEHMAN COLL
CUNY - RICHMOND COLL
CUNY JHN JAY COL CRIM J
CUNY MT SINAI SCH MD
CUNY YORK COLLEGE
DARTMOUTH COLLEGE
DAVIDSON COLLEGE
DENISON UNIVERSITY
DEPAUW UNIVERSITY
DICKINSON COLLEGE
DICKINSON SCH OF LAW
DREW UNIVERSITY
EARLHAM COLLEGE
FRANKLIN + MARSHALL COL
FRENO ST COL BKRSFLD
FRESNO ST COL MAIN CAMP
FURMAN UNIVERSITY
GA INST TECH MAIN CAMPU
GRINNELL COLLEGE
HAMILTON COLLEGE
HARVEY MUDD COLLEGE
HAVERFORD COLLEGE
ILLINOIS INST OF TECH
IND UNIV ESTRN IND CTR
INST PAPER CHEM-L U
KALAMAZOO COLLEGE
KENYON COLLEGE
KNOX COLLEGE
LAFAYETTE COLLEGE
LAWRENCE UNIV MAIN CAMP
LEHIGH UNIVERSITY
MACALESTER COLLEGE
MIDDLEBURY COLLEGE
MILLS COLLEGE
MOUNT HOLYOKE COLLEGE
NEW COLLEGE
OBERLIN COLLEGE
OCCIDENTAL COLLEGE
OHIO WESLEYAN UNIVERSIT
PITZER COLLEGE
POLYTECHNIC INST BROOKL
POMONA COLLEGE
REED COLLEGE
RICHARD BLAND COL WM MA
S DIEGO ST CALEXICO
SAN DIEGO ST COL MAIN C
SAN FRANCISCO STATE COL
SMITH COLLEGE
SOUTHRN TECH INST GA TE
SOUTHWESTERN AT MEMPHIS
ST OLAF COLLEGE
STEVENS INSTITUTE OF TE
SUNY COL FORSTRY MAIN C
SUNY COL CERAMCS ALFRED
SUNY COL OF AG AT CORNL
SUNY COL HOME EC CORNEL
SUNY DWNSTATE MED CR
SUNY HLTH SCI CTR BU
SUNY IND LABR REL CORNL
SUNY STATE UNIV BINGHAM
SUNY STATE U STONY BRK
SUNY UPSTATE MED CTR
SUNY VET COL CORNELL
SWARTHMORE COLLEGE
TRINITY COLLEGE
U S COAST GUARD ACADEMY
U S MERCHANT MARINE ACA
U S MILITARY ACADEMY
U S NAVAL ACADEMY
UNION COLLEGE
UNIV OF SAN FRANCISCO
UNIVERSITY OF THE SOUTH
UNIVERSITY OF SANTA CLA

QUALITY IV INSTITUTIONS (Cont'd)

VASSAR COLLEGE
WABASH COLLEGE
WASHINGTON + LEE UNIV
WEBB INST OF NAVAL ARCH
WELLESLEY COLLEGE
WELLS COLLEGE
WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY
WHITMAN COLLEGE
WILLIAMS COLLEGE
WORCESTER POLY INSTITUT

QUALITY V INSTITUTIONS

ADRIAN COLLEGE
AGNES SCOTT COLLEGE
ALBERTUS MAGNUS COLLEGE
ALBION COLLEGE
ALBRIGHT COLLEGE
ALFRED UNIV MAIN CAMPUS
ALLEGHENY COLLEGE
ALMA COLLEGE
ASHLAND COLLEGE
AUGSBURG COLLEGE
AUGUSTANA COLLEGE
AUSTIN COLLEGE
BALDWN-WALLACE-MAIN CMP
BARAT COL OF SACRED HEA
BATES COLLEGE
BEMIDJI STATE COLLEGE
BENNINGTON COLLEGE
BEREA COLLEGE
BETHANY COLLEGE
BETHANY COLLEGE
BETHEL COLLEGE
BIRMINGHAM SOUTHERN COL
BUCKNELL UNIVERSITY
CAL STATE POLY SN LUIS
CAL ST POLY COL POMONA
CALIF STATE COL LONG BC
CALIF STATE COL LOS ANG
CANISIUS COLLEGE
CAPITAL UNIVERSITY
CARROLL COLLEGE
CENTENARY COL FOR WOMEN
CENTRAL MICHIGAN UNIV
CENTRE COL OF KENTUCKY
CHATHAM COLLEGE
CHICO STATE COLLEGE
CHURCH COLLEGE OF HAWAI
CITADEL MILITARY COL S
CLARKSON COL OF TECH
COE COLLEGE
COL OF THE HOLY NAMES
COL OF THE HOLY CROSS
COLBY COLLEGE
COLLEGE OF NEW ROCHELLE
COLORADO STATE COLLEGE
CONCORDIA TEACHERS COL
CORNELL COLLEGE
CUNY QUEENS COLLEGE
DAVID LIPSCOMB COLLEGE
DREXEL UNIV
EAST TEXAS STATE UNIV
EASTERN OREGON COLLEGE
EASTERN MICHIGAN UNIV
ELMHURST COLLEGE
ELMIRA COLLEGE
EMMANUEL COLLEGE
EMORY + HENRY COLLEGE
FISK UNIVERSITY
FLORIDA PRESBYTERIAN CO
FRIENDS UNIVERSITY
GALLAUDET COLLEGE
GEORGE PEABODY COL TCHR
GEORGETOWN COLLEGE
GEORGIA STATE COLLEGE
GETTYSBURG COLLEGE
GODDARD COLLEGE
GONZAGA UNIVERSITY
GORDON COLLEGE
GOSHEN COL + BIBLICAL S
GOUCHER COLLEGE
GUSTAVUS ADOLPHUS COLLE
GWYNEDD-MERCY COLLEGE
HAMLINE UNIVERSITY
HAMPDEN SYDNEY COLLEGE
HANOVER COLLEGE
HEIDELBERG COLLEGE
HILLSDALE COLLEGE
HIRAM COLLEGE
HOBART + WM SMITH COLLE
HOFSTRA UNIVERSITY
HOLLINS COLLEGE
HOOD COLLEGE
HOPE COLLEGE
HOWARD PAYNE COLLEGE
HUMBOLDT STATE COLLEGE
ILLINOIS COLLEGE
ILLINOIS STATE UNIVERSI
ILLINOIS WESLEYAN UNIV
IMMACULATE HEART COLLEG
ITHACA COLLEGE
JAMESTOWN COLLEGE
JOHN CARROLL UNIVERSITY
JUNIATA COLLEGE
KING COLLEGE
LA SALLE COLLEGE
LAKE FOREST COLLEGE
LAMAR STATE COL TECH
LE MOYNE COLLEGE
LEBANON VALLEY COLLEGE
LEWIS + CLARK COLLEGE
LG IS U MERRIWEATHER CA

QUALITY V INSTITUTIONS (Cont'd)

LG IS U BROOKLN COL PHA
LG IS U SOUTHAMPTON COL
LG IS U UNIV CENTER
LINFIELD COLLEGE
LORAS COLLEGE
LOUISIANA POLY INSTITUT
LOYOLA U LOS ANG MAIN C
LUTHER COLLEGE
MACMURRAY COLLEGE
MANCHESTER COLLEGE
MANHATTANVILLE COLLEGE
MANKATO STATE COLLEGE
MARIETTA COLLEGE
MARLBORO COLLEGE
MARY BALDWIN COLLEGE
MARYGROVE COLLEGE
MEMPHIS STATE UNIVERSIT
MICH TECH U MAIN CAMPUS
MICH TEC U LK SUP ST CO
MILLIKIN UNIVERSITY
MILLSAPS COLLEGE
MISSISSIPPI COLLEGE
MONMOUTH COLLEGE
MONMOUTH COLLEGE
MONT COL MINRL SCI + TE
MONTCLAIR STATE COLLEGE
MORAVIAN COL MAIN CAMPU
MORAVIAN COL THEO SM
MORNINGSIDE COLLEGE
MOUNT UNION COLLEGE
MUHLENBERG COLLEGE
MUNDELEIN COLLEGE
MUSKINGUM COLLEGE
N MEX INST MINING + TEC
NAZARETH COL OF ROCHEST
NEWARK COL OF ENGINEERI
NEWTON COL SACRED HEART
NORTH CENTRAL COLLEGE
NORTH PARK COL + THEO S
NORTHERN ARIZONA UNIV
NORWICH UNIVERSITY
O NTHRN-RIVERSD HOSP
OAKLAND UNIVERSITY
OH NTHRN U WSTRN OH ED
OH NTHRN UNI-ALL CAM
OHIO NTHRN U MAIN CAMPU
OKLAHOMA CITY UNIVERSIT
OREGON COLLEGE OF EDUC
OTTERBEIN COLLEGE
P M C COLLEGES
PACIFIC LUTHERAN UNIV
PARSONS COLLEGE
PHILLIPS UNIVERSITY
PRINCIPIA COLLEGE
RANDOLPH MACON COLLEGE
RANDOLPH MACON WOMANS C
RIDER COLLEGE
RIPON COLLEGE
ROCKFORD COLLEGE
ROLLINS COLL-ALL CMP
ROLLINS COL MAIN CAMPUS
ROLLINS COL PATRICK
ROOSEVELT UNIVERSITY
ROSE POLYTECHNIC INST
ROSEMONT COLLEGE
RUSSELL SAGE MAIN CAMPU
RUSSELL SAGE JC OF ALBA
S DAK SCH MINES + TECH
SACRAMENTO STATE COLLEG
SAN FERNANDO VLY ST COL
SAN FRANCISCO COL WOMEN
SAN JOSE STATE COLLEGE
SARAH LAWRENCE COLLEGE
SCRIPPS COLLEGE
SEATTLE PACIFIC COLLEGE
SEATTLE UNIVERSITY
SETON HILL COLLEGE
SHIMER COLLEGE
SIMMONS COLLEGE
SIMPSON COLLEGE
SKIDMORE COL MAIN CAMPU
SKIDMORE COL HOSP BR
SLIPPERY ROCK STATE COL
SOUTHERN CONN STATE COL
SOUTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY
SPRINGFIELD COLLEGE
ST FRANCIS COLLEGE
ST JOHNS COL MAIN CAMPU
ST JOHNS COL SANTA FE N
ST JOHNS UNIVERSITY
ST LAWRENCE UNIVERSITY
ST MARYS COL CALIFORNIA
ST MARYS COLLEGE
ST XAVIER COLLEGE
STEPHEN F AUSTIN ST COL
STETSON UNIVERSITY
STONEHILL COLLEGE
SUNY COLLEGE FREDONIA

QUALITY V INSTITUTIONS (Cont'd)

SUNY COLLEGE NEW PALTZ
SUNY COLLEGE ONEONTA
SUNY COLLEGE OSWEGO
SUNY STATE UNIV ALBANY
SUSQUEHANNA UNIVERSITY
SWEET BRIAR COLLEGE
TEX LUTH COLL-ALL CP
TEX LUTH COL MAIN CAMPU
TRANSYLVANIA COLLEGE
TRINITY UNIVERSITY
TRINITY COLLEGE
TUSCULUM COLLEGE
U S AIR FORCE ACADEMY
UNIV OF TEXAS AT EL PAS
UNIV OF PUGET SOUND
UNIV OF CHATTANOOGA
UNIV OF STHRN MISSISSIP
UNIV OF N C AT GREENSBO
UNIV STHWSTRN LOUISIANA
UNIVERSITY OF DALLAS
UNIVERSITY OF DAYTON
UNIVERSITY OF REDLANDS
UNIVERSITY OF BRIDGEPOR
UNIVERSITY OF HARTFORD
UPSALA COLLEGE
URSINUS COLLEGE
VALPARAISO UNIVERSITY
VIRGINIA MILITARY INST
WASHINGTON JEFFERSON CO
WASHINGTON COLLEGE
WEBER STATE COLLEGE
WESTERN WASHINGTON ST C
WESTERN ILLINOIS UNIV
WESTERN MARYLAND COLLEG
WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIV
WESTMINSTER COLLEGE
WESTMONT COLLEGE
WHEATON COLLEGE
WHEATON COLLEGE
WILKES COLLEGE
WILLAMETTE UNIVERSITY
WILSON COLLEGE
WIS STATE UNIV LA CROSS
WIS STATE UNIV OSHKOSH
WIS STATE UNIV STEVNS P
WIS STATE UNIV SUPERIOR
WIS STATE UNIV PLATTEVL
WITTENBERG UNIVERSITY
WOFFORD COLLEGE
XAVIER UNIVERSITY

QUALITY VI INSTITUTIONS

ABILENE CHRISTIAN COLLE
ACAD OF THE NEW CHURCH
ADAMS STATE COLLEGE
AGRIC + TECH COL OF N C
AGRIC MECH + NORMAL COL
ALABAMA A + M COLLEGE
ALABAMA COLLEGE
ALABAMA STATE COLLEGE
ALASKA METHODIST UNIV
ALBANY COL OF PHARMACY
ALBANY STATE COLLEGE
ALCORN A + M COLLEGE
ALDERSON BROADDUS COLLE
ALLENTWN COL ST FR D SA
ALLEN UNIVERSITY
ALLIANCE COLLEGE
ALMA WHITE COLLEGE
ALVERNIA COLLEGE
ALVERNO COLLEGE
AMERICAN CONS OF MUSIC
AMERICAN INTERNATL COL
ANDERSON COLLEGE
ANDREWS UNIVERSITY
ANGELO STATE COLLEGE
ANNA MARIA COL FOR WOME
ANNHURST COLLEGE
APPALACHIAN ST UNIVERSI
AQUINAS COLLEGE
ARIZ BIB COL OF BIOLA C
ARK ST UNIV MAIN CAMPUS
ARK ST UNIV BEEBE BRANC
ARKANSAS BAPTIST COLLEGE
ARKANSAS A + M COLLEGE
ARKANSAS COLLEGE
ARKANSAS POLYTECHNIC CO
ARMSTRONG COL
ARMSTRONG STATE COLLEGE
AROOSTOOK STATE COLLEGE
ART ACAD OF CINCINTI
ART CENTER COL OF DESIG
ASBURY COLLEGE
ASBURY THEO SEM
ASHEVILLE BILTMORE COL
ASSUMPTION COLLEGE
ATHENAEUM OF OHIO
ATHENS COLLEGE
ATLANTA CHRISTIAN COLL
ATLANTIC UNION COLLEGE
ATLANTIC CHRISTIAN COL
AUGUSTA COLLEGE
AUGUSTNIAN COL MERMAC V
AURORA COLLEGE
AUSTIN PEAY STATE UNIV
AVILA COLLEGE
AZUSA PACIFIC COLLEGE
BABSON INST OF BUS ADMI
BAKER UNIVERSITY
BALL STATE UNIVERSITY
BALTIMORE COL-COMMRC
BALTIMORE HEBREW COL
BANGOR THEO SEM
BAPTIST BIBLE SEM INC
BAPTIST COL-CHARLSTN
BARBER-SCOTIA COLLEGE
BARD COLLEGE
BARRINGTON COLLEGE
BARRY COLLEGE
BARTLESVLLE WSLYAN C
BEAVER COLLEGE
BELHAVEN COLLEGE
BELKNAP COLLEGE
BELLARMIN(-URSULIN)
BELL-URS ST THOS SEM
BELMONT ABBEY COLLEGE
BELMONT COLLEGE
BENEDICT COLLEGE
BENJAMIN FRANKLIN UNIV
BENNETT COLLEGE
BENTLEY COLLEGE ACC + F
BERKSHIRE CHRISTIAN COL
BERRY COLLEGE
BETHANY BIBLE COLLEGE
BETHANY LUTH COL + THEO
BETHANY NAZARENE COLLEG
BETHEL COLLEGE
BETHEL COLLEGE INC
BETHEL COLLEGE + SEMINA
BETHUNE COOKMAN COLLEGE
BIOLA COLLEGE MAIN CAMP
BISCAYNE COLLEGE INC
BISHOP COLLEGE
BLACK HILLS STATE COLLE
BLACKBURN COLLEGE
BLISS COLLEGE
BLOOMFIELD COLLEGE
BLOOMSBURG STATE COLLEG
BLUE MOUNTAIN COLLEGE

QUALITY VI INSTITUTIONS (Cont'd)

BLUEFIELD STATE COLLEGE
BLUFFTON COLLEGE
BOB JONES UNIVERSITY
BOISE STATE COLLEGE
BORROMEO SEM OF OHIO
BOSTON CONS OF MUSIC
BOWIE STATE COLLEGE
BRENAU COLLEGE
BRENTWOOD COLLEGE
BRESCIA COLLEGE
BRIAR CLIFF COLLEGE
BRIARCLIFF COLLEGE
BRIDGEPORT ENGR INST
BRIDGEWATER COLLEGE
BRYANT COLLEGE OF BUS A
BUENA VISTA COLLEGE
CABRINI COLLEGE
CAL ST COL DOMINGUEZ HL
CAL ST COL SAN BERNARDI
CALDWELL COL FOR WOMEN
CALIF COL OF ARTS + CRA
CALIF INST OF THE ARTS
CALIF STATE COL FULLERT
CALIFORNIA STATE COLLEG
CALIFORNIA BAPTIST COL
CALIFORNIA LUTHERAN COL
CALIFORNIA MARITIME ACA
CALVARY BIBLE COLLEGE
CALVIN COLLEGE
CAMPBELLSVILLE COLLEGE
CAMPBELL COLLEGE
CANAAN COLL
CAPITOL INST OF TECH
CARDINAL STRITCH COLLEG
CARDINAL CUSHING COLLEG
CARDINAL GLENNON COLLEG
CARROLL COLLEGE
CARSON NEWMAN COLLEGE
CARTHAGE COLLEGE
CASCADE COLLEGE
CASTLETON STATE COLLEGE
CATAWBA COLLEGE
CATH COL IMMAC CONCEPTI
CATHERINE SPALDING COL
CATHOLIC UNIV OF P R
CATHOLIC TEACHER COL
CEDAR CREST COLLEGE
CEDARVILLE COLL
CEN MO ST COL INDEPENDN
CENTENARY COLLEGE
CENTRAL BIBLE COLLEGE
CENTRAL CONN STATE COL
CENTRAL METHODIST COLLE
CENTRAL STATE COLLEGE
CENTRAL STATE UNIVERSIT
CENTRAL UNIV OF IOWA
CENTRAL WASHINGTON ST C
CENTRAL WESLEYAN COLLEG
CENTRL MO ST C-ALL C
CENTRL MO ST COL MAIN C
CHADRON STATE COLLEGE
CHAMINADE COL OF HONOLU
CHAPMAN COLLEGE
CHESTNUT HILL COLLEGE
CHEYNEY STATE COLLEGE
CHICAGO STATE COLLEGE
CHICAGO TECHNICAL COLLE
CHRISTIAN BROTHERS COL
CINCINNATI BIBLE SEM
CLAFLIN COLLEGE
CLARION ST COL MAIN CAM
CLARK COLLEGE
CLARKE COLLEGE
CLEARY COLLEGE
CLEVELAND INST OF ART
CLEVELAND INST OF MUSIC
CLEVELAND STATE UNIV
CLRION ST COL VENANGO C
COKER COLLEGE FOR WOMEN
COL MT ST JOSEPH ON OHI
COL OF MOUNT ST VINCENT
COL OF NOTRE DAME OF MD
COL OF OUR LADY OF ELMS
COL OF THE SACRED HEART
COL ST JOS THE PROVIDER
COL ST ROSE MAIN CAMPUS
COLBY JR COL FOR WOMEN
COLGTE ROCHSTR-DIV S
COLL OF ARTESIA
COLL OF JEWISH STUDS
COLL OF THE SOUTHWST
COLLEGE MISERICORDIA
COLLEGE OF SOUTHERN UTA
COLLEGE OF GUAM
COLLEGE OF CHARLESTON
COLLEGE OF THE OZARKS
COLLEGE OF NOTRE DAME
COLLEGE OF IDAHO
COLLEGE OF ST FRANCIS
COLLEGE OF EMPORIA
COLLEGE OF ST BENEDICT
COLLEGE OF ST CATHERINE

QUALITY VI INSTITUTIONS (Cont'd)

COLLEGE OF ST SCHOLASTI
COLLEGE OF ST TERESA
COLLEGE OF ST THOMAS
COLLEGE OF GREAT FALLS
COLLEGE OF ST MARY
COLLEGE OF ST ELIZABETH
COLLEGE OF SANTA FE
COLLEGE OF INSURANCE
COLLEGE OF STEUBENVILLE
COLORADO WSTRN COLL
COLUMBIA BIBLE COLLEGE
COLUMBIA COLLEGE
COLUMBIA COLLEGE
COLUMBIA UNION COLLEGE
COLUMBIA UNIV COL PHARM
COLUMBUS COL ART + DESI
COMBS COLLEGE OF MUSIC
CONCORD COLLEGE
CONCORDIA COL MOORHEAD
CONCORDIA COL ST PAUL
CONCORDIA TEACHERS COL
CONVERSE COLLEGE
COPPIN STATE COLLEGE
COVENANT COLLEGE
CULVER STOCKTON COLLEGE
CUMBERLAND COLLEGE
CURRY COLLEGE
D C TEACHERS COLLEGE
D YOUVILLE COLLEGE
DAKOTA WESLEYAN UNIV
DANA COLLEGE
DANIEL PAYNE COLLEGE
DAVIS + ELKINS COLLEGE
DEFIANCE COLLEGE
DEL VAL COL OF SCI + AG
DELAWARE STATE COLLEGE
DELTA STATE COLLEGE
DETROIT BIBLE COLLEGE
DETROIT COL OF BUSINESS
DETROIT INSTITUTE OF TE
DICKINSON STATE COLLEGE
DILLARD UNIVERSITY
DIOCESAN SISTERS COL
DIV OF CONTINUING ED
DOANE COLLEGE
DOMINICAN COLLEGE RACIN
DOMINICAN COL SAN RAFAE
DOMINICAN COL OF BLAUVE
DON BOSCO COLLEGE
DORDT COLLEGE
DOWLING COLL
DR MARTIN LUTHER COL
DRAKE COL OF FLORIDA
DRURY COLLEGE
DUCHESNE COL SACRED HEA
DUNBARTON COL HOLY CROS
DUNS SCOTUS COLLEGE
DYKE COLLEGE
E CAR U-CHERRY PT
E CAR U-S JOHNSON CT
E CARO U-CAMP LEJEUN
E CAROLINA U ALL CMP
E CAROLINA U MAIN CAMPU
E TENN ST U MAIN CAMPUS
E TENN ST U-BRISTOL
E TENN ST U-KINGSPRT
EAST CENTRAL STATE COL
EAST STROUDSBURG ST COL
EAST TEXAS BAPTIST COL
EASTERN BAPTIST COLLEGE
EASTERN COLLEGE
EASTERN CONN STATE COL
EASTERN ILLINOIS UNIV
EASTERN MENNONITE COLLE
EASTERN MONTANA COLLEGE
EASTERN NAZARENE COLLEG
EASTERN NEW MEXICO UNIV
EASTERN PILGRIM COLLEGE
EASTERN WASHINGTON ST C
EDGEWOOD COLLEGE
EDINBORO STATE COLLEGE
EDWARD WATERS COLLEGE
EISENHOWER COLL
ELIZABETHTOWN COLLEGE
ELIZABETH CITY STATE CO
ELON COLLEGE
EMBRY-RIDDLE AERO INST
EMERSON COLLEGE
ERSKINE COLLEGE
ESTRN KENTUCKY UNIVERSI
EUREKA COLLEGE
EVANGEL COLLEGE
FAIRFIELD UNIVERSITY
FAIRLEIGH DICKINSON UNI
FAIRLGH DCKSN-TEANCK
FAIRLGH DCKSN-ED WMS
FAIRMONT STATE COLLEGE
FAITH BAPTIST BIBLE COL
FARMINGTON STATE COLLEG
FAYETTEVILLE STATE COL
FEDERAL CITY COL
FERRIS STATE COLLEGE

QUALITY VI INSTITUTIONS (Cont'd)

FINCH COLLEGE
FINDLAY COLLEGE
FLORENCE STATE COLLEGE
FLORIDA INST OF TECH
FLORIDA MEMORIAL COLLEG
FLORIDA SOUTHERN COLLEG
FLORIDA TECH UNIV
FONTBONNE COLLEGE
FORT HAYS KANS STATE CO
FORT LEWIS COLLEGE
FORT VALLEY STATE COLLE
FORT WAYNE ART SCHOOL
FORT WAYNE BIBLE COLLEG
FRANCIS T NICHOLLS ST C
FRANCONIA COLLEGE
FRANKLIN COL OF INDIANA
FRANKLIN PIERCE COLLEGE
FRANKLIN UNIVERSITY
FREDERICK COLLEGE
FREE WILL BAPT BIBLE CO
FRIENDS BIBLE COL
FRIENDS WORLD COLL
FRLGH DCK-FLOR MADSN
FROSTBURG STATE COLLEGE
FT KENT STATE COLLEGE
FT WRIGHT COL HOLY NAME
GANNON COLLEGE
GARRETT THEO SEM
GEN BEADLE STATE COLLEG
GENERAL MOTORS INSTITUT
GENEVA COLLEGE
GEORGE FOX COLLEGE
GEORGE WILLIAMS COLLEGE
GEORGIA COLLEGE
GEORGIA SOUTHWESTERN CO
GEORGIA SOUTHERN COLLEG
GEORGIAN COURT COLLEGE
GLASSBORO STATE COLLEGE
GLENVILLE STATE COLLEGE
GOLDEN GATE COLLEGE
GOOD COUNSEL COLLEGE
GORHAM STATE COLLEGE
GRACE BIBLE COLLEGE
GRACE BIBLE INSTITUTE
GRACE THEOL SEM + COL
GRACELAND COLLEGE
GRAMBLING COLLEGE
GRAND CANYON COLLEGE
GRAND VALLEY STATE COL
GRATZ COLL
GREENSBORO COLLEGE
GREENVILLE COLLEGE
GRND RPDS BAPT COL + SE
GROVE CITY COLLEGE
GUILFORD COLLEGE
GULF COAST BIBLE COL
HAMPTON INSTITUTE
HARDIN SIMMONS UNIVERSI
HARDING COL MAIN CAMPUS
HARRIS TEACHERS COLLEGE
HARTWICK COLLEGE
HASTINGS COLLEGE
HAWAII LOA COLL
HEALD ENGR COLLEGE
HEBREW TCHRS COLLEGE
HEBREW UNION COL-ALL
HENDERSON STATE COLLEGE
HENDRIX COLLEGE
HIGH POINT COLLEGE
HIRAM SCOTT COLL
HOLY APOSTLES SEMNRY
HOLY FAMILY COLLEGE
HOLY FAMILY COLLEGE
HOUGHTON COLLEGE
HOUSTON BAPTIST COLLEGE
HRDNG COL SCH BBL TN
HUNTINGDON COLLEGE
HUNTINGTON COLLEGE
HURON COLLEGE
HUSSON COLLEGE
HUSTON TILLOTSON COLLEG
IDAHO STATE UNIVERSITY
IMMAC CONCEPTION SEMINA
IMMACULATA COLLEGE
INCARNATE WORD COLLEGE
IND U OF PA MAIN CAMPUS
IND U PA PUNXSUTAWNEY
IND U PA ARMSTRONG CO C
IND UNIV HERRON SCH ART
INDIANA CENTRAL COLLEGE
INDIANA INSTITUTE OF TE
INDIANA STATE UNIVERSIT
INDIANA U OF PA-ALL
INTER AMER U-P R-ALL
IONA COLLEGE MAIN CAMPU
IONA COL ST GABRIEL COL
IOWA WESLEYAN COLLEGE
JACKSON STATE COLLEGE
JACKSONVILLE STATE UNIV
JACKSONVILLE UNIVERSITY
JARVIS CHRISTIAN COLLEG
JERSEY CITY STATE COLLE

QUALITY VI INSTITUTIONS (Cont'd)

JEWISH THEOL SEM OF AME
JOHN BROWN UNIVERSITY
JOHN F KENNEDY COLL
JOHN J PERSHING COLL
JOHNSON C SMITH UNIV
JOHNSON STATE COLLEGE
JONES COLLEGE
JONES COL ORLANDO CA
JUDSON COLLEGE
JUDSON COLLEGE
JUILLIARD SCHOOL OF MUS
KANS ST COL OF PITTSBUR
KANS ST TCHRS COL EMPOR
KANSAS CITY ART INSTITU
KANSAS WESLEYAN UNIV
KEARNEY STATE COLLEGE
KENTUCKY CHRISTIAN COL
KENTUCKY SOUTHERN COLLE
KENTUCKY STATE COLLEGE
KENTUCKY WESLEYAN COLLE
KEUKA COLLEGE
KINGS COLLEGE
KINGS COLLEGE
KIRKLAND COLLEGE
KNOXVILLE COLLEGE
KUTZTOWN STATE COLLEGE
L A BAPT COL + THEOL SE
LA GRANGE COLLEGE
LA ROCHE COLLEGE
LA VERNE COLLEGE
LADYCLIFF COLLEGE
LAKE ERIE COLLEGE
LAKELAND COLLEGE
LAMBUTH COLLEGE
LANCASTER THEO SEM
LANDER COLLEGE
LANE COLLEGE
LANGSTON UNIVERSITY
LAWRENCE INST TECHNOLOG
LAYTON SCHOOL OF ART
LE MOYNE COLLEGE
LEA COLLEGE
LEE COLLEGE
LENOIR-RHYNE COLLEGE
LESLEY COLLEGE
LETOURNEAU COLLEGE
LEWIS COLLEGE
LEWIS-CLARK NORMAL SCHO
LIMESTONE COLLEGE
LINCOLN CHRISTIAN COLLE
LINCOLN MEMORIAL UNIV
LINCOLN UNIVERSITY
LINCOLN UNIVERSITY
LINDENWOOD COLLEGE
LITTLE ROCK UNIVERSITY
LIVINGSTON STATE COLLEG
LIVINGSTONE COLLEGE
LOCK HAVEN STATE COLLEG
LOMA LNDA U LOMA LNDA C
LOMA LNDA U LA SIERRA C
LONGWOOD COLLEGE
LORETTO HEIGHTS COLLEGE
LOUISIANA COLLEGE
LOWELL TECHNOLOGICAL IN
LOYOLA COLLEGE
LYCOMING COLLEGE
LYNCHBURG COLLEGE
LYNDON STATE COLLEGE
MACKINAC COLLEGE
MADISON BUSINESS COLLEG
MADISON COLLEGE
MADONNA COLLEGE
MAINE MARITIME ACADEMY
MALONE COLLEGE
MANHATTAN BIBLE COLL
MANHATTAN COLLEGE
MANHATTAN SCHOOL OF MUS
MANNES COLLEGE OF MUSIC
MANSFIELD STATE COLLEGE
MARIAN COL OF FOND DU L
MARIAN COL INDIANAPOLIS
MARILLAC COLLEGE
MARION COLLEGE MARION
MARIST COLLEGE
MARK HOPKINS COLL
MARS HILL COLLEGE
MARSHALL UNIV MAIN CAMP
MARSHALL UNIV LOGAN BR
MARSHALL UNIV WILLIAMSO
MARY COLLEGE
MARY HARDIN BAYLOR COL
MARY MANSE COLLEGE
MARYCREST COLLEGE
MARYKNOLL SEMINARY
MARYKNOLL SEM
MARYLAND INST COL OF AR
MARYLHURST COL MAIN CAM
MARYMOUNT COLLEGE
MARYMOUNT COLLEGE
MARYMOUNT COLLEGE
MARYMOUNT MANHATTAN COL
MARYVILLE COLLEGE

QUALITY VI INSTITUTIONS (Cont'd)

MARYVLLE COL SACRED HEA
MARYWOOD COLLEGE
MASS COLL OF OPTOMET
MASS COL OF PHARMACY
MASS MARITIME ACADEMY
MASSACHUSETTS COL OF AR
MAYVILLE STATE COLLEGE
MCKENDREE COLLEGE
MCMURRY COLLEGE
MCNEESE STATE COLLEGE
MCPHERSON COLLEGE
MEDAILLE COLLEGE
MEDICAL COLLEGE OF S C
MEDICAL COLL GEORGIA
MEMPHIS ACADEMY OF ARTS
MENLO COLLEGE
MERCER UNIV-ALL CAMP
MERCER UNIV MAIN CAMPUS
MERCER U-STHN S PHRM
MERCY COLLEGE OF DETROI
MERCY COLLEGE
MERCYHURST COLLEGE
MEREDITH COLLEGE
MESSIAH COLLEGE
METHODIST COLLEGE
METHODIST THEO SCH-O
METROPOLITAN STATE COL
MICHIGAN LUTHERAN COLLE
MIDAMERICA NAZARENE
MIDDLE TENNESSEE ST UNI
MIDLAND LUTHERAN COLLEG
MIDWESTERN UNIVERSITY
MIDWESTERN COL
MIDWSTRN BAPT THEO S
MILES COLLEGE
MILLERSVILLE STATE COL
MILLIGAN COLLEGE
MILLS COLLEGE OF EDUC
MILTON COLLEGE
MILTONVALE WESLEYAN COL
MILWAUKEE SCHOOL OF ENG
MINN BIBLE COLLEGE
MINNEAPOLIS SCHOOL OF A
MINOT STATE COLLEGE
MISS STATE COL FOR WOME
MISS VALLEY STATE COLLE
MISSISSIPPI INDUS COLLE
MISSOURI VALLEY COLLEGE
MO SCH OF RELIGION
MOBILE COLLEGE
MOLLOY CATH COL MAIN CA

MOLLOY CATH ST ALBRT
MOORE COLLEGE OF ART
MOORHEAD STATE COLLEGE
MOREHEAD STATE UNIVERSI
MOREHOUSE COLLEGE
MORGAN STATE COLLEGE
MORRIS BROWN COLLEGE
MORRIS COLLEGE
MORRIS HARVEY COLLEGE
MOUNT ANGEL COLLEGE
MOUNT ANGEL SEMINARY
MOUNT MARTY COLLEGE
MOUNT MERCY COLLEGE
MOUNT MERCY COLLEGE
MOUNT SENARIO COLLEGE
MOUNT ST PAUL COLLEGE
MOUNT ST JOSEPH COLLEGE
MOUNT ST MARYS COLLEGE
MOUNT ST SCHOLASTICA CO
MOUNT ST AGNES COLLEGE
MOUNT ST MARYS COLLEGE
MOUNT ST MARY COLLEGE
MOUNT ST MARY COLLEGE
MT MARY COL MAIN CAMPUS
MULTNOMAH SCHOOL OF BIB
MURRAY STATE UNIVERSITY
MUSEUM ART SCHOOL
N C COLLEGE AT DURHAM
N C SCHOOL OF THE ARTS
N C WESLEYAN COLLEGE
N H COL ACCT + COMMERCE
NASSON COLLEGE
NATHANIEL HAWTHORNE COL
NATIONAL COLLEGE OF EDU
NATL COLLEGE OF BUSINES
NAZARETH COL OF KENTUCK
NAZARETH COLLEGE
NEBRASKA WESLEYAN UNIV
NER ISRAEL RABBINICAL C
NEVADA SOUTHERN UNIV
NEW ENG CONS OF MUSIC
NEW ENGLAND COLLEGE
NEW HAVEN COLLEGE
NEW MEXICO HIGHLANDS UN
NEW YORK COLLEGE OF MUS
NEWARK STATE COLLEGE
NEWBERRY COLLEGE
NIAG U OUR LADY ANGL
NIAGARA UNIV MAIN CAMPU
NICHOLS COL OF BUS ADM
NORTH CENTRAL BIBLE COL

QUALITY VI INSTITUIONS (Cont'd)

NORTH GEORGIA COLLEGE
NORTHEASTERN STATE COL
NORTHEAST BIBLE INST
NORTHEASTERN ILL ST COL
NORTHEAST MISSOURI S T
NORTHERN STATE COLLEGE
NORTHERN MICHIGAN UNIV
NORTHERN MONTANA COLLEG
NORTHLAND COLLEGE
NORTHROP INST OF TECH
NORTHWEST COLLEGE
NORTHWESTERN STATE COL
NORTHWEST CHRISTIAN COL
NORTHWEST NAZARENE COL
NORTHWESTERN COLLEGE
NORTHWEST MISSOURI ST C
NOTRE DAME COLLEGE
NOTRE DAME COLLEGE
NOTRE DAME COL STATEN I
NOTRE DAME COLLEGE
NTHEST LOUISIANA ST COL
NTHESTRN COLL BIBLE INS
NTHWSTRN ST COL LOUISIA
NY INST TECH-ALL CAM
NY INST TECH MAIN CAMPU
NY INST TECH OLD WESTBU
NYACK MISSIONARY COLLEG
OAKLAND CITY COLLEGE
OAKWOOD COLLEGE
OGLETHORPE COLLEGE
OHIO DOMINICAN COLL
OK SCH B ACC FIN LAW
OKLA COL OF LIBERAL ART
OKLA PANHANDLE STATE CO
OKLAHOMA BAPTIST UNIV
OKLAHOMA CHRISTIAN COL
OLD DOMINION COLLEGE
OLIVET COLLEGE
OLIVET NAZARENE COLLEGE
ORAL ROBERTS UNIV
OREGON TECH INSTITUTE
OTTAWA UNIVERSITY
OUACHITA BAPTIST UNIV
OUR LADY OF THE LAKE CO
OUR LADY OF CINCIN COL
OUR LADY OF ANGELS COL
OUR LADY HOLY CROSS
OWOSSO COLLEGE
PACE COLL ALL CAMP
PACE COLLEGE MAIN CAMPU
PACE COL WESTCHESTER CA
PACIF SCH RELIG
PACIFIC CHRISTIAN CO
PACIFIC COLLEGE
PACIFIC UNIVERSITY
PACIFIC UNION COLLEGE
PAINE COLLEGE
PAN AMERICAN COLLEGE
PARK COLLEGE
PASADENA COLLEGE
PASDNA PLAYHS COL THR A
PATERSON STATE COLLEGE
PAUL QUINN COLLEGE
PEABODY CONS OF MUSIC
PEMBROKE STATE COL
PEPPERDINE COLLEGE
PERU STATE COLLEGE
PESTALOZZI FROEBELTC
PFEIFFER COLLEGE
PHILA COLLEGE OF BIBLE
PHILA COL-OSTEOP MED
PHILA COL PHARMACY + SC
PHILA COLLEGE OF ART
PHILA COL OF TEX + SCI
PHILA MUSICAL ACADEMY
PHILANDER SMITH COLLEGE
PIEDMONT COLLEGE
PIEDMONT BIBLE COL INC
PIKEVILLE COLLEGE
PORTLAND STATE UNIV
PRAIRIE VIEW A + M COL
PRESBYTERIAN COLLEGE
PRESTCOTT COLL
PROVIDENCE COLLEGE
QUEENS COLLEGE
QUINCY COLLEGE
QUINNIPIAC COLLEGE
R I SCHOOL OF DESIGN
RADFORD COLLEGE
REGIS COLLEGE
REGIS COL WOMEN-MAIN CA
REGIS COL WOMEN FRAMING
RHODE ISLAND COLLEGE
RICKER COLLEGE
RIO GRANDE COLLEGE
RIVIER COLLEGE
ROANOKE COLLEGE
ROBERTS WESLEYAN COLLEG
ROCHESTER INST TECHNOLO
ROCKHURST COLLEGE

QUALITY VI INSTITUTIONS (Cont'd)

ROCKY MOUNTAIN COLLEGE
ROSARY COLLEGE
ROSARY HILL COLLEGE
RUST COLLEGE
S E BIBLE COLL
S F CONS MUSIC
SACRD HEART DOMINICAN C
SACRED HEART UNIVERSITY
SACRED HEART COLLEGE
SACRED HEART SEMINARY
SAGINAW VALLEY COLLEGE
SALEM COLLEGE
SALEM COL-CLARKSBURG
SALEM COLLEGE
SALISBURY STATE COLLEGE
SALVE REGINA COLLEGE
SAM HOUSTON STATE COL
SAMFORD UNIVERSITY
SAN FRISCO ART INST COL
SAN JOSE BIBLE COLLEGE
SAN LUIS REY COLLEGE
SAVANNAH STATE COLLEGE
SCH OF DAYTON ART IN
SCH OF MUSEUM FINE ARTS
SCHOOL OF THE OZARKS
SCHOOLS OF THE ART INS
SELMA UNIVERSITY
SEM OF OUR LADY OF PROV
SHAW UNIVERSITY
SHELTON COLLEGE
SHENANDOAH COL + CONS M
SHEPHERD COLLEGE
SHIPPENSBURG STATE COL
SHORTER COLLEGE
SHORTER COLLEGE
SIENA COLLEGE
SIENA COLL
SIENA COLL
SIENA COLL
SIENA HEIGHTS COLLEGE
SIMPSON BIBLE COLLEGE
SIOUX FALLS COLLEGE
SONOMA STATE COLLEGE
SOUTH CAROLINA ST COLLE
SOUTH TEXAS JR COLLEGE
SOUTHEASTERN STATE COL
SOUTHEASTERN UNIVERSITY
SOUTHEASTERN BIBLE COL
SOUTHEAST MISSOURI ST C
SOUTHERN OREGON COLLEGE
SOUTHERN STATE COLLEGE
SOUTHERN MISSIONARY COL
SOUTHERN STATE COLLEGE
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA COL
SOUTHERN COLORADO ST CO
SOUTHERN UNIV + A + M C
SOUTHWESTN ASSEMB GOD C
SOUTHWEST TEXAS STATE C
SOUTHWESTERN STATE COL
SOUTHWESTERN COLL
SOUTHWESTERN COLLEGE
SOUTHWEST MINN STATE CO
SOUTHWEST MISSOURI ST C
SPELMAN COLLEGE
SPRING ARBOR COLLEGE
SPRING HILL COLLEGE
ST AMBROSE COLLEGE
ST ANDREWS PRESBY COL
ST ANSELMS COLLEGE
ST AUGUSTINES COL
ST BENEDICT COLLEGE
ST BENEDICTS COLLEGE
ST BERNARD COLLEGE
ST BONAVENTURE UNIVERSI
ST CHARLES BORROMEO SEM
ST CLOUD STATE COLLEGE
ST DOMINIC COLLEGE
ST EDWARDS UNIVERSITY
ST FRANCIS COLLEGE
ST FRANCIS COLLEGE
ST FRANCIS COLLEGE
ST GREGORYS COLLEGE
ST JOHN COL OF CLEVELAN
ST JOHN FISHER COL INC
ST JOHNS COLLEGE
ST JOS COLL CAPU SEM
ST JOS SEM COL MAIN CAM
ST JOSEPH COLLEGE
ST JOSEPH COLLEGE
ST JOSEPH COL MAIN CAMP
ST JOSEPH COL E CHICAGO
ST JOSEPHS COLLEGE
ST JOSEPH COLLEGE
ST JOSEPHS COL FOR WOME
ST LEO COLLEGE
ST LOUIS COL OF PHARMAC
ST LOUIS INST MUSIC
ST MARTINS COLLEGE
ST MARY COLLEGE
ST MARY OF THE WOODS CO

QUALITY VI INSTITUTIONS (Cont'd)

ST MARY OF THE PLAINS C
ST MARYS UNIVERSITY
ST MARYS COLLEGE
ST MARYS DOMINICAN COL
ST MARYS SEM + U MAIN C
ST MARYS ST CHARLES COL
ST MARYS COLLEGE
ST MARYS COLLEGE
ST MEINRAD SEMINARY
ST MICHAELS COLLEGE
ST NORBERT COLLEGE
ST PATRICKS COL
ST PAUL BIBLE COLLEGE
ST PAULS COLLEGE
ST PAULS SCH THEOLOG
ST PETERS COLLEGE
ST PROCOPIUS COLLEGE
ST THOMAS SEMINARY
ST THOMAS AQUINAS COLLE
ST VINCENT COLLEGE
STANISLAUS STATE COLLEG
STATE COLLEGE OF ARK
STATE COL AT BRIDGEWATE
STATE COL AT FITCHBURG
STATE COL AT FRAMINGHAM
STATE COL AT LOWELL
STATE COL AT NORTH ADAM
STATE COL AT SALEM
STATE COL AT WESTFIELD
STATE COL AT WORCESTER
STATE COL AT BOSTON
STEPHENS COLLEGE
STERLING COLLEGE
STHEASTRN MASS TECH INS
STHESTRN LOUISIANA COL
STILLMAN COLLEGE
STOUT ST UNIV MAIN CAMP
STOUT ST U BARRON CO BR
SUFFOLK UNIV MAIN CAMPU
SUFFOLK UNIV LAW SCH
SUL ROSS STATE COLLEGE
SUNY COLLEGE BROCKPORT
SUNY COLLEGE BUFFALO
SUNY COLLEGE CORTLAND
SUNY COLLEGE GENESEO
SUNY COLLEGE PLATTSBURG
SUNY COLLEGE POTSDAM
SUNY MARITIME COLLEGE
SUNY OLD WESTBURY
SUNY RANGER SCH FOR
SWAIN SCH OF DESIGN
TABOR COLLEGE
TAHOE PARADISE COL
TALLADEGA COLLEGE
TARKIO COLLEGE
TARLETON STATE COLLEGE
TAYLOR UNIVERSITY
TEMPLE BUELL COLLEGE
TENN AG + INDUS ST UNIV
TENN TECHNOLOGICAL UNIV
TENN WESLEYAN COLLEGE
TENNESSEE TEMPLE COLLEG
TEXAS A + I UNIVERSITY
TEXAS COLLEGE
TEXAS SOUTHERN UNIV
TEXAS WESLEYAN COLLEGE
THIEL COLLEGE
THOMAS COLLEGE
TIFFIN UNIVERSITY
TIFT COLLEGE
TOCCOA FALLS INSTITUTE
TOUGALOO COLLEGE
TOWSON STATE COLLEGE
TRENTON STATE COLL
TREVECCA NAZARENE COLLE
TRI-STATE COLLEGE
TRINITY COLLEGE
TRINITY COLLEGE
TROY STATE U MAIN CAMPUS
TUSKEGEE INSTITUTE
U S DIEGO SCHL LAW
U SAN DIEGO COL FOR WOM
U SAN DIEGO COL FOR MEN
UNION COLLEGE
UNION COLLEGE
UNION UNIVERSITY
UNIV DUBUQUE MAIN CAMPU
UNIV DUBUQUE THEO SM
UNIV N H PLYMOUTH ST CO
UNIV NEBRASKA OMAHA
UNIV OF ALBUQUERQUE
UNIV OF CORPUS CHRISTI
UNIV OF EVANSVILLE
UNIV OF MARYLAND ST COL
UNIV OF NORTHERN IOWA
UNIV OF N H KEENE ST CO
UNIV OF N C AT CHARLOTT
UNIV OF SOUTH ALABAMA
UNIV OF SOUTH FLORIDA
UNIV OF TEX AT ARLINGTO

QUALITY VI INSTITUTIONS (Cont'd)

UNIV OF VA MARY WASH CO
UNIV OF WEST FLORIDA
UNIVERSITY OF ST THOMAS
UNIVERSITY OF RICHMOND
UNIVERSITY OF SCRANTON
UNIVERSITY OF TAMPA
UNIVERSITY OF BALTIMORE
UPPER IOWA UNIVERSITY
URSULINE COL FOR WOMEN
URSULINE COL
US INTERNATIONAL UNIV
VA CMMNWLTH U MAIN C
VA CMNWLTH MED COL V
VA STATE COL MAIN CAMPU
VA STATE COL NORFOLK DI
VALDOSTA STATE COLLEGE
VALLEY CITY STATE COLLE
VANDERCOOK COLL MUS
VENNARD COLLEGE
VERMONT COLLEGE
VILLA MARIA COLLEGE
VILLA MADONNA COLLEGE
VIRGA SEM AND COLL
VIRGA WESLEYAN COLL
VIRGINIA UNION UNIVERSI
VITERBO COLLEGE
W LIB ST COL HNCOCK CO
W LIBERTY ST COL MAIN C
W VIRGINIA INST OF TECH
W VIRGINIA WESLEYAN COL
WAGNER COLLEGE
WALLA WALLA COLLEGE
WALSH COLLEGE
WARNER PACIFIC COLLEGE
WARTBURG COLLEGE
WASHBURN UNIV OF TOPEKA
WASHINGTON BIBLE COLLEG
WASHINGTON STATE COLLEG
WAYLAND BAPTIST COLLEGE
WAYNE STATE COLLEGE
WAYNESBURG COLLEGE
WEBSTER COLLEGE
WESLEYAN COLLEGE
WEST CHESTER STATE COL
WEST COAST U MAIN
WEST CST U ORGE CTY
WEST GEORGIA COLLEGE
WEST TEXAS STATE UNIV
WEST VIRGINIA STATE COL
WESTBROOK JUNIOR COLLEG
WESTERN COLLEGE FOR WOM
WESTERN CONN ST COLLEGE
WESTERN CAROLINA UNIV
WESTERN MONTANA COLLEGE
WESTERN NEW ENGLAND COL
WESTERN NEW MEXICO UNIV
WESTMAR COLLEGE
WESTMINSTER COLLEGE
WESTMINSTER COLLEGE
WESTMINSTER CHOIR COLLE
WHEELING COLLEGE
WHEELOCK COLLEGE
WHITTIER COLLEGE
WHITWORTH COLLEGE
WHITWORTH COLL
WILBERFORCE UNIVERSITY
WILEY COLLEGE
WILLIAM CAREY COLLEGE
WILLIAM J BRYAN COLLEGE
WILLIAM JEWELL COLLEGE
WILLIAM PENN COLLEGE
WILLIAM WOODS COLLEGE
WILMINGTON COLLEGE
WILMINGTON COLLEGE
WINDHAM COLLEGE
WINONA STATE COLLEGE
WINSTON-SALEM STATE COL
WINTHROP COLLEGE
WIS STATE UNIV EAU CLAI
WIS STATE UNIV RIVER FL
WIS STATE UNIV WHITEWAT
WOODBURY COLLEGE
WRIGHT STATE UNIV
WSTRN BAPT COL + THEO S
WSTRN KENTUCKY UNIVERSI
WSTRN STATE COL COLORAD
XAVIER UNIVERSITY
YAMPA VALLEY COLLEGE
YANKTON COLLEGE
YOUNGSTOWN ST UNIVERSIT

QUALITY VII INSTITUTIONS

ABRAHAM BALDWIN AGRIC C
ACADEMY OF AERONAUTICS
ADIRONDACK COMMUNITY CO
AIMS COLLEGE
ALABAMA CHRISTIAN COLLE
ALBANY JR COLLEGE
ALEXANDR CTY STATE JR C
ALICE LLOYD COLLEGE
ALLAN HANCOCK COLLEGE
ALLEGANY COMMUNITY COL
ALLEN ACADEMY
ALLEN CO CMTY JUNIOR CO
ALPENA COMMUNITY COLLEG
ALPHONSUS COLL
ALTUS JR COLLEGE
ALVIN JR COLLEGE
AMARILLO COLLEGE
AMER RIVR COL MAIN CAMP
AMER RVR COL PLACERVL C
AMERICAN ACADEMY OF ART
ANCILLA DOMINI COLL
ANDERSON COLLEGE
ANDREW COLLEGE
ANGELINA CO JR COLL
ANNE ARUNDEL CMTY COLLE
ANOKA-RAMSEY ST JR COL
ANTELOPE VALLEY COLLEGE
APPALACHIAN BIB INST
AQUINAS JC OF BUS
AQUINAS JR COLL
AQUINAS SCHOOL
ARAPAHOE JR COLLEGE
AREA TEN CMTY COLLEGE
ARIZONA WESTERN COLLEGE
ASHEVL BUNCOMBE TECH IN
ASHLAND COUNTY TCHRS CO
ASSUMPTION COLLEGE
ATLANTIC CMTY COLLEGE
AUBURN COMMUNITY COLLEG
AUBURN MAINE SCH OF COM
AUSTIN STATE JR COLLEGE
AVERETT COLLEGE
BACONE COLLEGE
BAKERSFIELD COLLEGE
BALTIMORE JR COLLEGE
BARSTOW COLLEGE
BAY DE NOC COMMUNITY CO
BAY PATH JUNIOR COLLEGE
BECKER JR COLLEGE
BECKLEY COLLEGE
BEE COUNTY JUNIOR COLLE
BELLEVILLE JR COLLEGE
BELLEVUE CMTY COLLEGE
BENNETT COLLEGE
BERGEN CMTY COLL
BERK-CHAR-DOR TCH ED
BERKSHIRE CMTY COLLEGE
BIG BEND COMMUNITY COL
BISMARCK JR COLLEGE
BLACK HAWK COLLEGE
BLACK HAWK COL/KEWAN
BLINN COLLEGE
BLISS COLLEGE
BLUE MOUNTAIN CMTY COL
BLUE RIDGE CMTY COLLEGE
BLUEFIELD COLLEGE
BOONE JR COLLEGE
BRADFORD JR COLLEGE
BRAINERD STATE JR COLLE
BRANDYWINE JR COLL
BRAZOSPORT JR COLL
BREVARD COLLEGE
BREVARD JR COLLEGE
BREWTON PARKER COLLEGE
BRISTOL CMTY COLLEGE
BROOKDALE CMTY COLL
BROOME TECH COMMUNITY C
BRUNSWICK JUNIOR COLLEG
BRYANT + STRATTON COM S
BUCKS COUNTY CMTY COLLE
BUFFALO DIOCESAN PREP S
BURDETT COLLEGE
BUTLER CO CMTY COLLEGE
BUTLER COUNTY CMTY JR C
BUTTE JR COLLEGE
CABRILLO COLLEGE
CALDWELL TECH INST
CALIFORNIA CONCORDIA CO
CAMBRIDGE SCH OF BUSINE
CAMDEN COUNTY COLL
CAMERON STATE AGRIC COL
CANADA COLLEGE
CANAL ZONE COLLEGE
CANTON COMMUNITY COLLEG
CAPE COD COMMUNITY COL
CARL SANDBURG COLL
CASPER COLLEGE
CATAWBA VALLEY TECH INS
CATONSVILLE CMTY COLLEG
CAZENOVIA COLLEGE
CECIL CO CMUNTY COLL

QUALITY VII INSTITUTIONS (Cont'd)

CENTERVILLE COMMUNITY C
CENTRAL COLLEGE
CENTRAL FLORIDA JR COL
CENTRAL NEBR TECH
CENTRAL OREGON CMTY COL
CENTRAL PIEDMONT CMTY C
CENTRAL TECH INSTITUTE
CENTRAL TEXAS COLLEGE
CENTRAL VA CMTY COLLEGE
CENTRAL YMCA CMTY COLLE
CENTRALIA COLLEGE
CERRITOS COLLEGE
CHABOT COLLEGE
CHAFFEY COLLEGE
CHAMBERLAYNE JR COLL
CHAMPLAIN COLLEGE
CHARLES CO COMMUNITY CO
CHATTANOOGA CITY COLLEG
CHATTANOOGA ST TECH INS
CHESAPEAKE COLLEGE
CHGO CITY COL BOGAN CAM
CHGO CITY COL LOOP CAM
CHGO CTY COL CRANE CAM
CHGO CTY COL FENGER CAM
CHGO CTY COL STHEAST CA
CHGO CTY COL WILSON CAM
CHGO CTY COL WRIGHT CAM
CHGO CY COL AMNDSN-MYFA
CHICAGO ACAD OF FINE AR
CHIPOLA JR COLLEGE
CHOWAN COLLEGE
CHRISTIAN COL OF STHWES
CHRISTIAN COLLEGE
CHRSTOPHR COL CORP CHRS
CISCO JR COLLEGE
CITRUS JR COL
CITY COL OF SAN FRANCIS
CLACKAMUS CMTY COLLEGE
CLARENDON COLLEGE
CLARK CO TECH INST
CLARK COLLEGE
CLARKE MEMORIAL COLLEGE
CLATSOP CMTY COLLEGE
CLEVELAND STATE CMTY CO
CLOUD COUNTY CMTY JR CO
CMTY C ALLEG CO ALLEG C
CMTY C ALLEG CO EAST CA
CMTY C ALLEG CO SOUTH C
CMTY COL OF PHILA
CMTY COL OF BEAVER CO
CMTY COL OF DELAWARE CO
CMTY COLL OF DENVER
CMTY COLL-FINGER LKS
COAHOMA JR COLLEGE
COALINGA COLLEGE
COCHISE COLLEGE
COFFEYVILLE COLLEGE
COGSWELL POLY COLL
COL VIRGIN IS MAIN CAMP
COL VRGN IS-ST CROIX
COLBY CMTY JR COLLEGE
COLL OF DUPAGE
COLL OF EASTERN UTAH
COLL OF ST GERTRUDE
COLLEGE OF ALAMEDA
COLLEGE OF MARIN
COLLEGE OF SAN MATEO
COLLEGE OF SOUTHERN IDA
COLLEGE OF THE MAINLAND
COLLEGE OF THE DESERT
COLLEGE OF THE REDWOODS
COLLEGE OF THE SEQUOIAS
COLLEGE OF THE SISKIYOU
COLLEGE OF THE ALBEMARL
COLORADO MTN COLLEGE
COLUMBIA CHRISTIAN COL
COLUMBIA BASIN CMTY COL
COLUMBIA JR COLL
COLUMBIA STATE CMTY COL
COLUMBUS COLLEGE
COMPTON COLLEGE
CONCORDIA COLLEGE
CONCORDIA COLLEGE
CONCORDIA COLLEGIATE IN
CONCORDIA LUTHERAN COL
CONCORDIA LUTHERAN JR C
CONNORS STATE AGRIC COL
CONTRA COSTA COLLEGE
COOKE COUNTY JR COLLEGE
COPIAH LINCOLN JR COL
CORBETT JR COLL
CORNING COMMUNITY COLLE
COTTEY COLLEGE
COUNTY COL OF MORRIS
COWLEY COUNTY CMTY JR C
CROSIER SEMINARY
CROWDER COLLEGE
CUESTA COLLEGE
CUMBERLAND COUNTY COLLE
CUMBERLAND COL OF TENN
CUNY QUEENSBORO CMTY CO
CUNY BRONX COMMUNITY CO

QUALITY VII INSTITUTIONS (Cont'd)

CUNY KINGSBORO CMTY COL
CUNY MANHATTAN CMTY COL
CUNY N Y CITY CMTY COL
CUNY STATEN IS CMTY COL
CUYAHOGA CMTY C-ALL
CUYHOG CMTY COL METRO C
CUYHOG CMTY COL WSTRN C
CYPRESS COLLEGE
DABNEY LANCASTER CMTY C
DALLAS BAPTIST COLLEGE
DALTON JR COL
DANVILLE CMTY COLLEGE
DANVILLE JR COLLEGE
DAVENPORT COL OF BUSINE
DAVIDSON CO CMTY COL
DAVIS JR COL OF BUS
DAWSON COLLEGE
DAYTONA BEACH JR COLLEG
DE ANZA JR COLLEGE
DE LIMA JR COLLEGE
DE SALES PREP SEM INC
DEAN JR COLLEGE
DEKALB COLLEGE
DEL MAR COLLEGE
DELAWARE TECH/CMTY C
DELGADO COL
DELTA COLLEGE
DEVRY TECH INSTITUTE
DIABLO VALLEY COLLEGE
DIXIE COLLEGE
DODGE CITY CMTY JR COL
DODGE COUNTY TEACHERS C
DONNELLY COLLEGE
DOOR KEWAUNEE CO T C
DURHAM TECH INST
DUTCHESS CMTY COLLEGE
EAST CENTRAL JR COLLEGE
EAST LOS ANGELES COLLEG
EAST MISSISSIPPI JR COL
EASTERN ARIZONA COLLEGE
EASTERN WYOMING COLLEGE
EDISON JUNIOR COLLEGE
EDMONDS CMTY COLLEGE
EL CAMINO COLLEGE
EL CENTRO COLLEGE
EL RENO JR COLLEGE
ELGIN COMMUNITY COLLEGE
ELIZABETH SETON COLLEGE
ELLEN CUSHING JR COLLEG
ELLSWORTH COLLEGE
EMMANUEL COLLEGE
EMMETSBURG CMTY COLLEGE
ENDICOTT JR COLLEGE
ENGLEWOOD CLIFFS COLLEG
ENTERPRISE ST JR COL
ERIE CO TECH INSTITUTE
ESSEX COMMUNITY COLLEGE
ESSEX COUNTY COLL
ESTHERVILLE JR COLLEGE
ESTRN IA CMTY COL CLINT
ESTRN IA CMTY C SCOTT C
ESTRN IA CMY COL MUSCAT
ESTRN OKLAHOMA STATE CO
EVERETT CMTY COLLEGE
FAIRBURY JR COLLEGE
FASHION INSTITUTE OF TE
FAYETTEVILLE TECH IN
FELICIAN COLLEGE
FERGUS FALLS STATE JR C
FERRUM JR COLLEGE
FISHER JUNIOR COLLEGE
FLATHEAD VLY CMTY COL
FLINT CMTY JR COLLEGE
FLORENCE DARL TCH ED
FLORIDA COLLEGE
FLORIDA JR COL JACKSONV
FLORIDA KEYS JUNIOR COL
FLORISANT VLY COLL
FOOTHILL COLLEGE
FORSYTH TECH INST
FORSYTH SCH DENT HYGNST
FORT SCOTT CMTY JR COL
FRANK PHILLIPS COLLEGE
FRANKLIN INST OF BOSTON
FREDERICK CMTY COLLEGE
FREED HARDEMAN COLLEGE
FREEMAN JR COLLEGE
FREMONT CO CMTY COLL
FRESNO CITY COLLEGE
FRIENDSHIP JUNIOR COLLE
FT STEILACOOM CMTY C
FT WORTH CHRISTIAN COL
FULLERTON JR COLLEGE
FULTON-MONTGOMRY CMTY C
GADSDEN STATE JR COLLEG
GAINESVILLE JR COLL
GALVESTON CMTY COLLEGE
GARDEN CITY CMTY JR COL
GARDNER WEBB COLLEGE
GARLAND JR COLLEGE
GASTON COLLEGE
GAVILAN COLLEGE

QUALITY VII INSTITUTIONS (Cont'd)

GENESEE CMTY COLLEGE
GEO C WALLACE ST TECH S
GEORGIA MILITARY COLLEG
GLEN OAKS CMTY COLLEGE
GLENDALE COMMUNITY COL
GLENDALE COLLEGE
GLOUCESTER CO COLL
GOGEBIC COMMUNITY COLLE
GOLDEN VLY LUTH COLLEGE
GOLDEN WEST COLLEGE
GOLDEY BEACOM JR COL
GORDON MILITARY COLLEGE
GRAND RAPIDS JR COLLEGE
GRAND VIEW COLLEGE
GRAYS HARBOR COLLEGE
GRAYSON CO JR COLLEGE
GREEN MOUNTAIN COLLEGE
GREEN RIVER CMTY COLLEG
GREENBRIER COLLEGE
GREENFIELD CMTY COLLEGE
GREENVL TECHNICAL ED CT
GROSSMONT COLLEGE
GTR HARTFORD CMTY C
GUILFORD TECH
GULF COAST JR COLL
GULF PARK JR COLLEGE
HAGERSTOWN JR COLLEGE
HANNIBAL LA GRANGE COL
HARCUM JR COLLEGE
HARFORD JR COLLEGE
HARRISBURG AREA CMTY CO
HARTFORD COL FOR WOMEN
HARTFORD ST TECH COLLEG
HARTNELL COLLEGE
HENDERSON COUNTY JR COL
HENRY FORD COMMUNITY CO
HERKIMER CO CMTY COL
HESSTON COLLEGE
HIBBING STATE JR COLLEG
HIGHLAND CMTY JR COLLEG
HIGHLAND COMMUNITY COL
HIGHLAND PARK COLLEGE
HIGHLINE COLLEGE
HILL JUNIOR COLLEGE
HILLSBOROUGH JR COLL
HINDS JR COLLEGE
HIWASSEE COLLEGE
HOLMES JR COLLEGE
HOLY CROSS JR COLL
HOLYOKE COMMUNITY COLLE
HORRY-MAR-GEO TCH ED
HOWARD COUNTY JR COL
HUDSON VALLEY CMTY COL
HUMPHREYS COLLEGE
HUTCHINSON CMTY JR COL
IA CEN CMTY COL FT DODG
IA CEN CMY COL EAGLE GR
IA CEN CMY COL WEBSTER
IA WSTRN CMY COL CLARIN
IA WSTRN CMY COL CNCL B
ILLINOIS CENTRAL COLLEG
ILLINOIS VALLEY CMTY CO
IMMACULATA COLLEGE
IMMACULATA COL OF WASH
IMMACULATA COLLEGE
IMPERIAL VALLEY COLLEGE
INDEPENDENCE CMTY JR CO
INDIAN RIVER JR COLLEGE
ISOTHERMAL CMTY COLLEGE
ITASCA STATE JR COLLEGE
ITAWAMBA J C-ALL CAM
ITAWAMBA JC VOC TEC
ITAWAMBA JR COLLEGE
J CONNALLY TECH INST
JACKSN CO JC PERKNSTN C
JACKSON CMTY COLLEGE
JACKSON STATE CMTY C
JACKSONVILLE COLL
JAMES SPRUNT INST
JAMESTOWN COMMUNITY COL
JC OF ST LOUIS CO
JEFF DAVIS COL PERKINST
JEFFERSON COLLEGE
JEFFERSON COMMUNITY COL
JEFFERSON DAVIS ST JR C
JEFFERSON STATE JR COL
JOHN A LOGAN COLL
JOHN C CALHOUN ST TECH
JOHN TYLER CMTY COLLEGE
JOHNSN + WALES JR COL B
JOLIET JR COLLEGE
JONES COUNTY JR COLLEGE
JR COLLEGE BROWARD COUN
JUDSON BAPTIST COLLEGE
KALAMAZOO VLY CMTY C
KANKAKEE CMTY COLL
KANS CTY KANS CMTY JR C
KASKASKIA COLLEGE
KELLOGG COMMUNITY COLLE
KEMPER MILITARY SCH + C

QUALITY VII INSTITUTIONS (Cont'd)

KENDALL COLLEGE
KENNESAW JR COLL
KENOSHA TECH INST
KETTERING COL MD ART
KEYSTONE JR COLLEGE
KILGORE COLLEGE
KINGS COLLEGE
KIRKLAND CMTY COLL
KIRKLAND HALL COLLEG
KISHWAUKEE COLLEGE
KITTRELL COLLEGE
LA SALETTE SEM
LABETTE CMTY JR COLLEGE
LACKAWANNA JR COLLEGE
LAKE-SUMTER JR COLLEGE
LAKE MICHIGAN COLLEGE
LAKE REGION JR COLLEGE
LAKELAND CMTY COLLEGE
LAKELAND COLLEGE
LAKEWOOD ST JR COLLEGE
LAMAR JR COLLEGE
LANCASTER SCH OF BIBLE
LANE COMMUNITY COLLEGE
LANEY COLLEGE
LANGLADE COUNTY TCHRS C
LANSING COMMUNITY COLLE
LAREDO JR COLLEGE
LASELL JR COLLEGE
LASSEN COLLEGE
LATTER-DAY SAINTS BUS C
LEE COLLEGE
LEES MCRAE COLLEGE
LEES JR COLLEGE
LEHIGH CO CMTY COLLEGE
LEICESTER JUNIOR COLLEG
LENOR CO CMY COL MAIN C
LINCOLN COLLEGE
LINCOLN LAND JR COLL
LINDSEY WILSON COLLEGE
LINN BENTON CMTY COLLEG
LK CTY JC + FOR RNGER S
LON MORRIS COLLEGE
LONG BEACH CITY COLLEGE
LORAIN CO CMTY COLLEGE
LOS ANGELES CITY COLLEG
LOS ANGELES HARBOR COL
LOS ANGELES PIERCE COL
LOS ANGELES STHWST COL
LOS ANGELES TR TECH COL
LOS ANGELES VALLEY COL
LOUISBURG COLLEGE
LOURDES JR COLL
LOWER COLUMBIA COLLEGE
LUBBOCK CHRISTIAN COLLE
LUTHER COLLEGE
LUZERNE CO CMTY COLLEGE
MACCORMAC COLLEGE
MACOMB CO C C-CTR CA
MACOMB COUNTY CMTY COL
MACON JR COLLEGE
MADISON VOC-TECH + AD S
MAGIC VLY CHRISTIAN COL
MANATEE JR COLLEGE
MANCHESTER COMMUNITY CO
MANITOWOC CO TCHRS COL
MANOR JR COLLEGE
MARIA REGINA COLLEGE
MARIA COLLEGE OF ALBANY
MARICOPA TECH COLL
MARION INSTITUTE
MARJORIE WEBSTER JR COL
MARSHALLTOWN CMTY COLLE
MARTIN COLLEGE
MARY HOLMES JR COLLEGE
MARYMOUNT COLLEGE OF VA
MARYMOUNT COLLEGE
MASS BAY COMMUNITY COL
MASSASOIT CMTY COLLEGE
MATER CHRISTI SEMINARY
MATER DEI COLLEGE
MATTATUCK CMTY COL
MAUNAOLU COLLEGE OF MAU
MCCOOK COLLEGE
MCHENRY CO JR COLL
MCLENNAN CMTY COLLEGE
MERCED COLLEGE
MERCER CO CMTY COL
MERIDIAN JUNIOR COLLEGE
MERRITT COLLEGE
MESA COLLEGE MAIN CAMPU
MESA COMMUNITY COLLEGE
MESABI STATE JR COLLEGE
METRO STATE JR COLLEGE
METROPOLITAN JR COLLEGE
MIAMI-DADE JUNIOR COLLE
MIAMI-JACOBS JR COL BUS
MICHIGAN CHRISTIAN JR C
MIDDLE GEORGIA COLLEGE
MIDDLESEX CMTY COL
MIDDLESEX COUNTY COLLEG
MIDWAY JR COLLEGE
MILES CMTY COLLEGE

QUALITY VII INSTITUTIONS (Cont'd)

MILWAUKEE INST TECHNOLO
MINERAL AREA COLLEGE
MIRA COSTA COL
MISSIONARY AVN INST
MISSISSIPPI DELTA JR CO
MISSOURI SOUTHERN COLLE
MISSOURI WESTERN COL
MITCHELL COLLEGE
MITCHELL COLLEGE
MOBERLY JR COLLEGE
MOBILE STATE JR COLLEGE
MODESTO JR COLLEGE
MOHAWK VALLEY CMTY COL
MONROE COMMUNITY COLLEG
MONROE COUNTY CMTY COL
MONTCALM CMTY COLLEGE
MONTEREY PENINSULA COL
MONTGOMERY CO CMTY COL
MONTGOMERY JC ROCKVILLE
MONTGOMERY JC TAKOMA PA
MONTICELLO COLLEGE
MONTREAT-ANDERSON COL I
MOODY BIBLE INSTITUTE
MOORPARK JR COLLEGE
MORAINE VLY CMTY COL
MORRISTOWN COLLEGE
MORSE COLLEGE INC
MORTON JR COLLEGE
MOUNT ALOYSIUS JR COLLE
MOUNT IDA JR COLLEGE
MOUNT OLIVE JR COL
MOUNT SAN ANTONIO COLLE
MOUNT ST CLARE COLLEGE
MOUNT VERNON JR COLLEGE
MOUNT WACHUSETT CMTY CO
MT HOOD CMTY COLLEGE
MT SACRED HEART COL
MT SAN JACINTO COLLEGE
MT VERNON COMTY COLL
MT VERNON NAZARN COL
MULTNOMAH COLLEGE
MURRAY ST COL AG+APSCI
MUSKEGON BUSINESS COLLE
MUSKEGON CO CMTY COLLEG
N DAK STATE SCHOOL SCI
N DAK SCHOOL OF FORESTR
N H TECH INST CONCORD
N H VOC INST MANCHESTER
N H VOC INST PORTSMOUTH
N IOWA AREA CMTY COLLEG

NAPA COLLEGE
NASSAU CMTY COLLEGE
NATCHEZ JR COLLEGE
NATIONAL BUSINESS COLLE
NAVARRO JR COLLEGE
NEOSHO COUNTY CMTY JR C
NEW ENGLAND AERO INS
NEW MEXICO JUNIOR COLLE
NEW MEXICO MILITARY INS
NEW RIVER VOC TECH SCHO
NEWTON JR COLLEGE
NIAGARA COUNTY CMTY COL
NO CENTRAL MICHIGAN COL
NORFOLK JR COLLEGE
NORMAN COLLEGE
NORMANDALE ST JR COL
NORTH COUNTRY CMTY C
NORTH CTRAL TCH INST
NORTH FLORIDA JR COLLEG
NORTH GREENVILLE JR COL
NORTH HENNEPIN ST JR CO
NORTH IDAHO JR COLLEGE
NORTH PLATTE COLLEGE
NORTH SHORE CMTY COLLEG
NORTHAMPTN COMMERCIAL C
NORTHEAST ALA ST JR COL
NORTHEASTERN JR COLLEGE
NORTHEASTN OKLA A + M C
NORTHERN ESSEX CMTY COL
NORTHERN OKLAHOMA COLLE
NORTHERN VA CMTY COLLEG
NORTHLAND STATE JR COL
NORTHWEST ALA ST JR COL
NORTHWEST COMMUNITY COL
NORTHWESTERN MICHIGAN C
NORTHWOOD INST ALMA
NORTHWSTRN CONN CMTY CO
NORWALK COMMUNITY COL
NORWALK STATE TECH COL
NTHAMPTN CO AREA CMTY C
NTHEST MISSISSIPPI JR C
NTHESTRN CHRISTN JR COL
NTHWD INST CEDAR HILL T
NTHWD INST W BADEN IND
NTHWOOD INST MAIN CAMPU
NTHWST MISSISSIPPI JR C
OAKLAND COMMUNITY COLLE
OAKLD C C-ORCHRD RDG
OAKLND C C-AUBURN HL
OAKLND C C-HGHLND LK

QUALITY VII INSTITUTIONS (Cont'd)

OCEAN COUNTY COLLEGE
ODESSA COLLEGE
OHIO COL OF APP SCIENCE
OHIO TECHNICAL COLLEGE
OHIO VALLEY COLLEGE
OHLONE COL
OKALOOSA WALTON JR COL
OKLAHOMA MILITARY ACAD
OLNEY CENTRAL COLL
OLYMPIC COLLEGE
ONONDAGA CMTY COLLEGE
ORANGEBG CALHN TCH ED
ORANGE COAST COLLEGE
ORANGE COUNTY CMTY COL
ORLANDO JUNIOR COLLEGE
OTERO JR COLLEGE
OTTUMWA HEIGHTS COLLEGE
OUR LADY OF ANGELS JR C
OUTAGAMIE CO TCHRS COL
PACKER COLLEGIATE INST
PADUCAH JR COLLEGE
PALM BEACH JR COLLEGE
PALMER COL MAIN CAMPUS
PALMER COLLEGE COLUMBIA
PALMER JR COL
PALO VERDE COLLEGE
PALOMAR COLLEGE
PAMLICO INDUS ED CTR
PANOLA COLLEGE
PARIS JR COLLEGE
PARKLAND JR COLLEGE
PARSONS SCHOOL OF DESIG
PASADENA CITY COLLEGE
PATRICK HENRY ST JR COL
PAUL SMITHS COL ARTS SC
PEACE COLLEGE
PEARL RIVER JR COLLEGE
PEIRCE JUNIOR COLLEGE
PENINSULA COLLEGE
PENN HALL JR COLLEGE
PENSACOLA JR COLLEGE
PERKINSTN COL MAIN CAMP
PERRY NORMAL SCHOOL
PHILLIPS CO CMTY COLLEG
PHOENIX COLLEGE
PIEDMONT TECH ED CTR
PINE MANOR JR COLLEGE
PITT TECHNICAL INSTITUT
POINT PARK COLLEGE
POLK CO TCHRS COLL
POLK JUNIOR COLLEGE
PORTERVILLE COLLEGE
PORTLAND CMTY COLLEGE
POST JR COLLEGE
POTEAU CMTY COLLEGE
POTOMAC ST COL OF W VA
PRAIRIE STATE COLLEGE
PRATT CMTY JR COLLEGE
PRENTISS NORM INDUS INS
PRESENTATION COLLEGE
PRINCE GEORGES CMTY COL
PUERTO RICO JR COLLEGE
QUEEN OF THE APOSTLES C
QUINCY JR COLLEGE
QUINSIGAMOND CMTY COLLE
R MORRIS JC-CORAOPLS
RACINE KENOSHA COUNTY T
RAINEY RIVER ST JR COL
RANDOLPH TECHNICAL INST
RANGELY COL OF MESA COL
RANGER COLLEGE
RBT MORRIS JC-ALL CA
RCA INSTITUTES INC
REEDLEY COLLEGE
REINHARDT COLLEGE
RHODE ISLAND JR COLLEGE
RICHLAND TECHNICAL ED C
RICHMOND TECH INST
RICKS COLLEGE
RIO HONDO JUNIOR COLLEG
RIVERSIDE CITY COLLEGE
ROBERT MORRIS JR COLLEG
ROBT MORRIS COL OF CRTH
ROCHESTER STATE JR COL
ROCK VALLEY COLLEGE
ROCKINGHAM CMTY COLLEGE
ROCKLAND CMTY COLLEGE
ROGER WILLIAMS COLLEGE
SACRAMENTO CITY COLLEGE
SACRED HEART COLLEGE
SACRED HEART COLLEGE
SAINTS JUNIOR COLLEGE
SALEM TECH VOC CMTY COL
SAN ANTONIO COLLEGE
SAN BERNARDINO VALLEY C
SAN DIEGO CITY COL
SAN JACINTO COLLEGE
SAN JOAQUIN DELTA COLLE
SAN JOSE CITY COLLEGE
SANDHILLS CMTY COLLEGE

QUALITY VII INSTITUTIONS (Cont'd)

SANTA ANA COLLEGE
SANTA BARBARA CITY COL
SANTA FE JUNIOR COLLEGE
SANTA MONICA CITY COLLE
SANTA ROSA JR COLLEGE
SAUK COUNTY TEACHERS CO
SAUK VALLEY COLLEGE
SAYRE JR COLLEGE
SCHILLING INSTITUTE
SCHOOLCRAFT COLLEGE
SCHREINER INSTITUTE
SCOTTSBLUFF COLLEGE
SE IA CMTY COL BURLTN
SE IA CMTY COL KEOKUK
SEATTLE COMMUNITY COLLE
SEMINOLE JR COLLEGE
SEMINOLE JR COLLEGE
SHASTA COLLEGE
SHEBOYGAN CO TCHRS COL
SHELDON JACKSON JR COL
SHERIDAN COLLEGE
SHORELINE COMMUNITY COL
SIERRA COLLEGE
SILVERMINE COLLEGE OF A
SINCLAIR CMTY COLLEGE
SKAGIT VALLEY COLLEGE
SNEAD JR COLLEGE
SO CNTRL CMTY COL
SO PILGRIM COL
SOLANO COLLEGE
SOMERSET COUNTY COLL
SOUTH FLORIDA JR COLLEG
SOUTH GEORGIA COLLEGE
SOUTH PLAINS COLLEGE
SOUTHEASTERN ILLINOIS C
SOUTHEASTERN CMTY COLLE
SOUTHEASTN CHRISTIAN CO
SOUTHERN BAPTIST COLLEG
SOUTHERN SEM JR COLLEGE
SOUTHERN UNION ST JR CO
SOUTHESTRN BAPT COLL
SOUTHWEST BAPTIST COLLE
SOUTHWEST TEXAS JR COL
SOUTHWESTERN UNION COL
SOUTHWESTERN COLLEGE
SOUTHWESTERN COLLEGE
SOUTHWESTERN CMTY COLLE
SOUTHWESTRN CHRISTIAN C
SOUTHWOOD COLLEGE
SOUTHWST VA CMTY COL

SOUTHWSTERN OREG CMTY C
SOUTHWSTRN MICH CMTY CO
SPARTANBG CO TECH ED
SPARTANBURG JR COL
SPOKANE CMTY COLL
SPRING GARDEN INSTITUTE
SPRINGFIELD JR COLLEGE
SPRINGFLD TEC CMTY C
ST CATHERINE COLLEGE
ST CLAIR CO CMTY COLLEG
ST JOHNS COLLEGE
ST JOHNS RIVER JR COLLE
ST JOSEPH COL OF FLORID
ST JOSEPH SEMINARY
ST LAWRENCE SEMINARY
ST MARYS COLLEGE OF MD
ST MARYS COL OF O FALLO
ST MARYS JR COLLEGE
ST MARYS JUNIOR COLLEGE
ST PAULS COLLEGE
ST PETERSBURG JR COLLEG
ST PIUS X PREP SEMINARY
ST TECH INST-MEMPHIS
ST THOMAS SEMINARY
STATE FAIR CMTY COLL
STEVENS BUSINESS COLLEG
STEVENS HENAGER COL OGD
STEVNS HENGR COL MAIN C
STHWST MISSISSIPPI JR C
STRATFORD COLLEGE
STRAYER JR COLLEGE
SUE BENNETT COLLEGE
SUFFOLK CMTY COLLEGE
SULLINS COLLEGE
SULLIVAN COUNTY CMTY CO
SUMTER AREA TCH ED C
SUNY AG+TECH DELHI
SUNY AG+TECH MORRISVLLE
SUNY AG+TECH ALFRED
SUNY AG+TECH CANTON
SUNY AG+TECH COBLESKILL
SUNY AG+TECH FARMNGDALE
SUOMI COLLEGE
SURRY COMMUNITY COLLEGE
T J HARRIS JR COLLEGE
TACOMA COMMUNITY COLLEG
TAFT COLLEGE
TALLAHASSEE JR COLLEGE
TARRANT CO JUNIOR COLLE
TAYLOR COUNTY TCHRS COL

QUALITY VII INSTITUTIONS (Cont'd)

TECH INST ALAMANCE
TEMPLE JR COLLEGE
TEXARKANA COLLEGE
TEXAS SOUTHMOST COLLEGE
THAMES VLY ST TECH COL
THOMAS NELSON CMTY COL
THORNTON JR COLLEGE
THREE RIVERS JR COLLEGE
TMPKNS/CTLND CMTY CL
TOMBROCK COLLEGE
TREASURE VALLEY CMTY CO
TRENTON JR COLLEGE
TRI-COUNTY TECH ED C
TRINIDAD STATE JR COLLE
TRINITY CHRISTIAN COL
TRITON COLLEGE
TROCAIRE COLLEGE
TRUETT MCCONNELL COLLEG
TYLER JR COLLEGE
ULSTER COUNTY CMTY COL
UMPQUA CMTY COLLEGE
UNION COLLEGE
URBANA COLLEGE
UTICA JR COLLEGE
VALENCIA JR COLLEGE
VALLEY FORGE MIL JR COL
VENTURA COLLEGE
VERMILION ST JR COLLEGE
VERMONT TECH COLLEGE
VERNON COUNTY TCHRS COL
VICTOR VALLEY COLLEGE
VICTORIA COLLEGE
VILLA JULIE COLLEGE INC
VILLA MARIA COL OF BUFF
VINCENNES UNIVERSITY
VIRGINIA INTERMONT COL
VIRGINIA SOUTHERN COLLE
VIRGINIA WESTERN CMTY C
VOORHEES COLLEGE
VOORHEES TECHNICAL INST
WABASH VALLEY COLLEGE
WADHAMS HALL SEMINARY
WALDORF COLLEGE
WALKER COLLEGE
WALLA WALLA CMTY COLLEG
WALSH INST OF ACCOUNTIN
WARREN WILSON COLLEGE
WASHINGTON TECH INST
WASHTENAW CMTY COLLEGE
WATERBURY STATE TECH CO
WAUBANSEE JR COLLEGE
WAUSHARA CO TCHR COL
WAYNE TECHNICAL INST
WEATHERFORD COLLEGE
WENATCHEE VALLEY COL
WENONAH STATE JR COLLEG
WENTWORTH INSTITUTE
WENTWORTH MILITARY ACAD
WESLEY COLLEGE
WEST VALLEY COLLEGE
WESTARK JUNIOR COLLEGE
WESTCHESTER CMTY COLLEG
WESTERN PIEDMONT CMTY C
WESTERN WYOMING CMTY CO
WHARTON COUNTY JR COL
WILKES COMMUNITY COLLEG
WILLIAMSPT AREA CMTY CO
WILLMAR STATE JR COLLEG
WILSON CO TECH INST
WINGATE COLLEGE
WINSTON CHURCHILL COLLE
WM L YANCEY ST JR COLLE
WM RANEY HARPER COLLEGE
WOOD JR COLLEGE
WORCESTER JR COLLEGE
WORTHINGTON STATE JR CO
WW HOLDING TECH INST
WYOMING VALLEY TECH INS
WYTHEVILLE CMTY COLLEGE
XAVERIAN COLLEGE
YAKIMA VALLEY COLLEGE
YORK CO TECH ED CTR
YORK COLLEGE
YORK JR COLLEGE
YOUNG HARRIS COLLEGE
YUBA COLLEGE